

grades established for the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6604. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 6605. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to undertake a project under the Federal Airport Act for the development and improvement of Ontario International Airport at Ontario, Calif., during the fiscal year 1950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6606. A bill to provide that the district judge for the eastern, middle, and western districts of Pennsylvania shall become a district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania alone when the first vacancy occurs in that district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6607. A bill to provide for the modification or cancellation of certain free licenses granted to the Government by private holders of patents and rights thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. J. Res. 388. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1950, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 389. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1950, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. J. Res. 390. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 413. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of American military government in Germany and the civilian administration which succeeded it; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 414. Resolution providing for the employment of one additional laborer (cloakroom), Doorkeeper's department; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 6608. A bill for the relief of Victoria Rolando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 6609. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Macbeth Lent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6610. A bill for the relief of Jaime Riel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 6611. A bill for the relief of Harley Eugene Squire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 6612. A bill for the relief of Maximilian Otto Ricker-Huetter and Mrs. Eugenia Ricker-Huetter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6613. A bill for the relief of Solomon Jacob and Mrs. Helen Jacob; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6614. A bill for the relief of Inger Werner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6615. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gerzon Warga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1562. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of La Fayette, Ind., opposing recognition by the United States of the Communist regime in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1563. Also, petition of citizens of Brook, Ind., favoring legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and to prohibit the broadcasting of such advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1564. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of members of the congregation of the First Christian Church, Pratt, Kans., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the newspapers and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1565. Also, petition of members of the congregation of the First Christian Church, Pratt, Kans., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the newspapers and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1566. Also, petition of members of the congregation of the First Christian Church, Pratt, Kans., requesting the passage of a bill to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce through the newspapers and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1567. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Milton, Wis., urging support of a bill to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio and also the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1568. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Evansville, Wis., urging the passage of a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1569. Also, petition of the Delavan Women's Club, of Delavan, Wis., protesting against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1570. Also, petition of the Saturday Club, of Beloit, Wis., unanimously opposing compulsory health education or national bureaucratic control of medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1571. Also, petition of the Federated Woman's Club, of Union Grove, Wis., urging favorable consideration of the world federation resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1572. Also, resolution of the County Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., providing that Congress be requested to establish the proposed Academy of the Air for the training of air-force personnel at General Mitchell Field, located at the birthplace of Gen. William Mitchell, the military pioneer and prophet of aviation as a dominant military weapon; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1573. By Mr. TAYLOR: Resolution of the City Council of the City of Mechanicville, N. Y., recommending and favoring the establishment of a proposed National Air Force Academy at the Ballston Spa Airport, Saratoga County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and glory, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. In a confused day keep our minds clear and clean and uncluttered by prejudice. In a clamorous day filled with angry accents of hatred and falsehood give us ears to hear the voices that speak of justice and freedom and world brotherhood. In a mad and sad day grant us sanity of mind and spirit, purity of heart, and a glad hope which sees a shining ray far down the future's broadening way. And Thine shall be the kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GILLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 4, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

HARRY F. BYRD, a Senator from the State of Virginia, appeared in his seat today.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Chair designates the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] to read Washington's Farewell Address to the Senate on February 22 next.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GILLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Downey	Hayden
Anderson	Dworshak	Hendrickson
Benton	Eastland	Hickenlooper
Brewster	Ecton	Hill
Bricker	Ellender	Hoey
Butler	Ferguson	Holland
Byrd	Frear	Humphrey
Chapman	Fulbright	Hunt
Connally	George	Ives
Cordon	Gillette	Jenner
Darby	Graham	Johnson, Tex.
Donnell	Green	Johnston, S. C.
Douglas	Gurney	Kefauver

Kem	McMahon	Schoeppel
Kerr	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Killgore	Malone	Sparkman
Knowland	Maybank	Stennis
Langer	Millikin	Taft
Leahy	Morse	Taylor
Lehman	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Lodge	Myers	Thye
Long	Neely	Tobey
Lucas	O'Connor	Vandenberg
McCarran	O'Mahoney	Watkins
McCarthy	Pepper	Wherry
McClellan	Robertson	Wiley
McFarland	Russell	Williams
McKellar	Saltonstall	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order entered yesterday, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is entitled to the floor. He is, therefore, recognized.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of introducing a bill?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Alabama and to other Senators who wish to introduce bills and present routine matters for the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa has yielded for the purpose of transaction of routine business. It will not be necessary for individual Senators to ask the Senator from Iowa to yield for such purpose.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the year 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

RETURN OF CERTAIN LAND TO PUBLIC DOMAIN

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to return to the public domain a tract of land known as the Battle Mountain Sanatorium Reserve, South Dakota (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of sev-

eral departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the excise tax on admission tickets to amusements; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the States of Georgia, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and New York, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 2181, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, relating to amendments of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the Sixth District Dental Society of Montana, and the Seattle (Wash.) District Dental Society, protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. C. J. Schjoll, of Monmouth, Oreg., transmitting a petition signed by sundry citizens of that city, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I present the petition for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures, as follows:

Senator GUY CORDON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 1847, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio.

The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent \$8,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946 as compared with \$3,700,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM OF ELECTRONIC RESEARCH—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF ROME, N. Y.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the

Common Council of the City of Rome, N. Y., relating to a long-range program of electronic research.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States Government has made plans as part of a long-range program of electronic research to move to the Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N. Y., the Watson Laboratories, Red Bank, N. J.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Rome does hereby approve of such a program and pledges the cooperation of said city of Rome to said air base as it may be from time to time enlarged; and be it further

Resolved, That the common council does hereby request the Congress of the United States and the United States Military Establishment, in the interest of economy and national defense, to effectuate the transfer of the said Watson Laboratories as soon as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be, and he hereby is, directed to send a copy of this resolution to the following: Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense; W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force; Congressman John C. Davies; and Senator Irving M. Ives, and Hon. Herbert Lehman.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—RESOLUTION OF BUFFALO (N. Y.) SEWER AUTHORITY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Buffalo (N. Y.) Sewer Authority, favoring an amendment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, relating to controlling pollution of interstate and boundary waters.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Niagara River has been described by the International Joint Commission as one of the most seriously polluted streams in the country and as such is now being surveyed by the United States Public Health Service under orders of said Commission; and

Whereas Niagara frontier communities and the Buffalo Sewer Authority are faced with the public obligation to take such actions as may serve to reduce the pollution reaching the Niagara River, and in connection therewith the Buffalo Sewer Authority has developed plans for reducing the effect of industrial wastes in the Buffalo River tributary to the Niagara River; and

Whereas the financial needs to construct the works essential to pollution abatement are of such magnitude as to impose a terrific burden upon and even invite financial crisis for the interested public bodies of this community: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Buffalo Sewer Authority, created by act of the New York State Legislature, petitions the Congress of the United States to amend Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Public Law No. 845, controlling pollution of interstate and boundary waters, and that the Congress of the United States appropriate such sums as the act and amendments would require so that funds will be available to Niagara frontier communities and the Buffalo Sewer Authority under the following provisions:

1. Change the section of the act which at present provides for loans up to \$250,000 to cities, villages, and other political units to allow loans of at least \$5,000,000 at an interest rate of 1 percent.

2. Change the provisions of the act to include under the term "treatment works" all works directly contributing to the abatement of an existing pollution problem in interstate or boundary waters; and be it further

Resolved, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be instructed to loan money at the rate of 1 percent for the above purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the Representatives of Congress from this community and the United States Senators from the State of New York be presented with copies of this resolution and respectfully requested to see that the same receives consideration by the Congress.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 2781. A bill relating to cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2782. A bill to provide for the promotion of carriers in the rural-delivery service in recognition of longevity of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 2783. A bill for the relief of the Reverend Aron Elek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2784. A bill to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., in accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 2785. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the acceptance by Lt. Comdr. Henry L. De Givie of appointment as honorary Belgian consul at Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2786. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2787. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 7½-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2788. A bill authorizing an appropriation for reprinting the 1949 Department of Agriculture Yearbook; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2789. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gloria Pearl Crockett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2790. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jen Yen Tchou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONSERVATION AND INCREASE OF WATER RESOURCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOWNEY (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. McFARLAND) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1300) to conserve and increase the Nation's water resources, for promotion of irrigation in arid areas, by research and demonstration of practical means of producing, from sea or other saline waters, water suitable for beneficial consumptive use, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR CLYDE M. REED, OF KANSAS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 201), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of Hon. Clyde M. Reed, late a Senator from the State of Kansas, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERSTATE GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution providing for an investigation of interstate gambling and racketeering activities, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me in explanation thereof be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 202) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of interstate gambling and racketeering activities and of the manner in which the facilities of interstate commerce are made a vehicle of organized crime. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee un-

der this resolution, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER ON RESOLUTION TO INVESTIGATE INTERSTATE GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, today I am filing a resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on the Judiciary to make a full investigation of interstate gambling and to make recommendations for such legislation as may be deemed necessary.

Responsible and nationally known reporters and magazine writers have for the past several years been writing of a national crime syndicate which they allege is slowly but surely through corruption gaining control of, or improper influence in, many cities throughout the United States.

On September 14, 1949, Mayor deLesseps S. Morrison, as president of the American Municipal Association, and speaking for that association, asked the Federal Government to investigate the encroachment by organized national racketeers on municipal governments throughout the United States with the intent to control their law-enforcement agencies.

The Chicago and California crime commissions in 1949 reported the insidious influence wielded by this crime syndicate through corruption of public officials and its political and financial control.

Also, Mr. President, the mayors of several large cities, such as Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Portland, and many others, have complained in the past year of attempts being made by national crime syndicates to control and corrupt the local political affairs of their respective cities, and that they do not have adequate means to cope with this well-organized and powerful criminal organization, and have asked the Federal Government for assistance in coping with this alleged criminal aggression.

There appears to be no adequate Federal statutes which can be invoked against the activities of this organized syndicate. The resolution I am filing today would authorize and direct the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate to make investigation to determine whether there is an organized syndicate operating in interstate commerce which is menacing the independence of free municipal governments, for the benefit of the criminal activities of the syndicate, and determine and report to the Senate their findings on whether the States and municipalities can, without Federal assistance, adequately cope with this organized crime movement. The committee would also be directed to investigate the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over the activities of any criminal syndicate, and make recommendations for any necessary legislation.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of interstate gambling and racketeering activities and of the manner in which the facilities of interstate commerce are made a vehicle of organized crime. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund

of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

ONE JOB FOR 1950—EDITORIAL FROM THE CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER

[Mr. SCHOEPPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "One Job for 1950," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS AT HAVANA, ILL.

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator LUCAS at Havana, Ill., on December 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL POWER POLICY—RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a pamphlet entitled "Federal Power Policy," issued by the American Public Power Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAPT. JOHN D. CROMMELIN—TRIBUTE BY WALTER WINCHELL

[Mr. MCCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article paying tribute to Capt. John D. Crommelin, by Walter Winchell, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO PERSONS IN THE UNITED STATES DESIROUS OF MIGRATING TO LIBERIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD Senate bill 1880, to provide aid to persons in the United States desirous of migrating to the Republic of Liberia, and for other purposes, together with a letter dated July 5, 1949, from Ernest A. Gross, Assistant Secretary of State, to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1880) introduced by Mr. LANGER on May 18, 1949, and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to provide aid to persons in the United States desirous of migrating to the Republic of Liberia, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to cooperate with the Republic of Liberia in furthering the interests and welfare of large numbers of persons who are residing in the United States and who desire to emigrate to and settle permanently in the Republic of Liberia. It is the intent of Congress that the benefits and provisions of this act shall apply to citizens of the United States, and aliens who are lawful residents in the United States, who may qualify as eligible for citizenship in the Republic of Liberia, and who by character, physical fitness, and climatic adaptability may qualify as migrants to be permanently settled in the Republic of Liberia, and who shall have voluntarily expressed a desire to become migrants under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized and directed to enter into negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Liberia for the purpose of obtaining the consent of that country to the migration and permanent settlement of individuals assisted in accordance with the provisions of this act. The President shall further negotiate with the Government of the Republic of Liberia

to secure reasonable guaranties that safety of life and limb and freedom of action for the migrants while under Liberian rule will be assured; that the Government of the Republic of Liberia will earnestly prohibit and punish any act or acts of intolerance or persecution, either political, social, or economic, of the migrants because of their condition as migrants; and that the migrants while aliens in the Republic of Liberia shall enjoy all the privileges and immunities of any other aliens resident in the Republic of Liberia, and that, after naturalization, they shall enjoy all the privileges and immunities of other citizens of the Republic of Liberia. The provisions of this section shall be a condition precedent to other provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a commission to be known as the Liberian Migration Commission, consisting of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate, for a term ending June 30, 1954, and one member of the Commission shall be designated by him as Chairman. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of \$10,000 per annum. The Commission may employ necessary personnel, including technicians, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and make provision for necessary supplies, facilities, and services to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this act. It shall be the duty of the Commission to formulate and issue regulations, necessary under the provisions of this act, and in compliance therewith, for the migration of eligible persons to the Republic of Liberia. It shall also be the duty of the Commission to report on February 1, 1950, and semiannually thereafter to the President and to the Congress on the situation regarding the migration of eligible persons to Liberia. At the end of its term the Commission shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress.

SEC. 4. (a) Under such regulations as the Commission may prescribe, any citizen of the United States, and any alien who is a lawful resident of the United States; who is in good physical condition and is capable by reason of his training, adaptability, intelligence, and ambition of becoming a self-sustaining settler in the Republic of Liberia, and who desires to become a migrant and settler in such country, may file an application on blanks prepared and supplied by the Commission requesting assistance in migrating to and permanently settling in the Republic of Liberia. Such application shall furnish such information as will enable the Commission to properly assess and evaluate the qualifications of the applicant. If the applicant is a householder, he may make application for all the members of his household as a unit. The application of a person responsible for the support and maintenance of children under the age of 16 years shall not be favorably acted upon unless such children are to accompany such applicant on his migration, or unless he has made adequate provision for their support and maintenance pending their transfer to join the applicant in the Republic of Liberia.

(b) The following persons shall not be eligible for migration under this act: Escaped convicts or fugitives from justice, persons under indictment and awaiting trial, persons who by reason of past criminal offenses are poor risks of becoming law-abiding and self-sustaining settlers in the Republic of Liberia, persons applying for migration for the purpose of defrauding creditors, and such other persons as the Commission may reasonably believe are likely to become public charges or social liabilities in the Republic of Liberia or who are otherwise unacceptable to the Government of the Republic of Liberia. The findings of the Commission with respect to

the eligibility of any person for migration under this act shall be final.

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission is authorized to lease, furnish, and equip such office space in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as it may deem necessary; order goods and services from private individuals or concerns in the ordinary course of trade; requisition any department, board, or agency of the United States for any available goods, services, or facilities which may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this act, without affecting the proper operation of such department, board, or agency; provide transportation by land and by sea to qualified applicants migrating under the provisions of this act, and to their households, from the initial point of departure in the United States to the point of settlement in the Republic of Liberia, and to contract with land and maritime transportation companies for such purposes to the extent necessary by reason of the fact that such transportation facilities are not available from the Government of the United States; and provide adequate subsistence, medical care, and other necessities of life for the migrants during transit and until finally settled at the point of settlement.

(b) With the consent of the Government of the Republic of Liberia, the Commission is authorized to select or approve suitable sites for settlement of migrants in the Republic of Liberia; to establish and operate reception and disembarkation centers, supply depots, commissaries, temporary housing at points of settlement, dispensaries, pharmacies, and first-aid stations, and such other buildings and facilities as are necessary and proper to safeguard the health of the migrants and to carry out the purposes of this act, together with all necessary equipment and personnel.

(c) The Commission is further authorized, within the limits of such funds as may be appropriated to it, to supply tools, equipment, materials, and technical assistance and advice, to the migrants when necessary to assist them in becoming self-sustaining members of their communities; to make loans to individuals, partnerships, or corporations composed of migrants, in meritorious cases, not to exceed \$1,000 in any case, on reasonably liberal terms and conditions, as initial capital for business and industrial enterprises in Liberia; and to cooperate with and render technical and other assistance to the Government of the Republic of Liberia, or its responsible agencies, in the establishment of towns and rural districts, improvement of conditions of public sanitation, construction of public works and facilities, reclamation of land, development and improvement of utilities, schools, hospitals, and transportation facilities, encouragement of business enterprise and capital investments in the Republic of Liberia, and the construction, development, or encouragement of such other public works or projects as will tend to raise the standard of living and increase the productivity of the Republic of Liberia.

SEC. 6. Such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 7. The authority conferred by this act shall expire on June 30, 1954. This act shall become effective upon the date of its enactment.

JULY 5, 1949.

MY DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: Reference is made to a letter received from the Committee on Foreign Relations under date of May 19, 1949, requesting the views of the Department in connection with S. 1880, introduced by Senator LANGER, proposing aid to persons desirous of emigrating to the Republic of Liberia.

The bill, designed as it is to encourage the movement of large numbers of persons

to Liberia, would seem to be contrary to the existing immigration policy of the Liberian Government of limiting entry to selected persons of special training or skills. This policy has been established for the very sound reason that the country is incapable of assimilating large numbers of immigrants in its present backward state of economic and social development.

In recent years, the Government of the United States has supplied, and is continuing to supply, financial and other assistance to Liberia in an effort to improve economic and social conditions in the country. Considerable progress is being made in this regard, but much more needs to be accomplished, in the opinion of the Department, before the country will be in a position to absorb any large number of immigrants.

During the past year or so, there has been a movement of small groups of West Indians to Liberia. Reports received in the Department indicate that many of these immigrants have quickly become disillusioned at conditions existing in the country and are anxious to return to their homeland or to emigrate elsewhere. It seems reasonable to assume that much the same situation would arise if large numbers of persons emigrated to Liberia under the provisions of S. 1880.

Until such time as there is a change in the existing immigration policy of the Liberian Government and a substantial improvement in the social and economic conditions in that country, the Department is of the opinion that it is highly inadvisable to encourage the movement of any large numbers of persons to Liberia as is the intent of S. 1880.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST A. GROSS,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. LANGER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in full in the RECORD one-hundred-and-some-odd telegrams sent to me in behalf of Senate bill 1880. The telegrams are all worded differently.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let's love our neighbor as ourselves. Cast a vote for S. 1880.

MISS RUTH SIMONS.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Prayers will do its part if you will do your part. Please vote for it, bill S. 1880.

Mrs. ARZULA EVERETTE,
Hazelwood, Pa.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To cast a vote for bill S. 1880 is playing a part of a friend.

NELLIE D. READIE.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let us reason together. Let us vote the same vote for bill S. 1880.

EARL PARRON.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We live for right, we fight for right, we vote for right. Please vote for bill S. 1880.

JAMES FLOYD KING.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Give your best and the best will come back to you. Please vote for the passage of bill S. 1880.

JAMES KEMPT.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Let us strive for our country making her the kingdom of reason and justice. Vote for bill S. 1880.

LORENN RANDALL.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: As a fisherman cast his line upon the water please cast your vote for S. 1880.

Mrs. LOLA LLOYD.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Let your line spread democracy then our nets will reap an abundance of good will from nations.

MAGGIE LASTER.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Liberia is an open door for a minority group. Vote for bill S. 1880.

LONNIE LASTER.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: You can depend on us. We believe we can depend on you. Vote for bill S. 1880.

ROSEVELT JONES.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: We believe in our Senators. We know they believe in us. Vote for bill S. 1880.

CARRIE FORD.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: A great work has been done, but a greater work will be done by passing S. 1880. Vote for it.

Mrs. CORA INGRAM.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Bill S. 1880 entails a good move by our country to open backward areas. Vote for it.

GEORGE INGRAM.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: To our Representative as we remembered you, now remember us to bill S. 1880.

WM. HACKETT.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: An opportunity that is made possible for settlers is the bill S. 1880. Please vote for it.

ODESSA HILL.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: It takes votes to pass the bill. Please vote in favor of bill S. 1880.

THEODORE MARTIN.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Our goal is a better life. Let us carry the ball to the frontiers of Liberia. Vote for bill S. 1880.

LOUISE HARTWELL,
Grindstone, Pa.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Qualified persons appeal for a vote. Please cast a vote for bill S. 1880.

HORACE WELLMAN.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Our representative is a light for the people. Please turn your light on; when S. 1880 comes up vote for it.

BEATRICE HEART.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: When bill S. 1880 comes before you support and vote for it. Thanks a million.

McREE JACKSON.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Nations who have shown their greatness are the nations who have opened up new frontiers. Please vote for bill S. 1880.

RALPH JOHNSON.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: Please vote for bill S. 1880 when it comes before you and thanks 2,000 times.

BERTHA McMILLER.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: As we sow, so shall we reap. Cast a vote for bill S. 1880.

JOHN CRAMPTON.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., January 5, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SIR: As a fellow citizen will you please cast a vote for bill S. 1880.

THOMAS BROWN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please let bill S. 1880 be real and not imaginative. Vote for it.
JIMMY LEE RAINES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A pilgrim traveler wants to go back home, please vote for bill S. 1880.
CRISTINE PATRICK.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please give your full support to bill S. 1880. It is an answer to prayer.
GEORGE PASSMORE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The biggest favor a Senator could do is vote for the bill S. 1880.
RAYMAN MCCORKLE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please vote for bill S. 1880. It is an open door to new life.
JAMES McMILLER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thousands would appreciate the opportunity given through the passage of bill S. 1880.
HUBBARD MILLER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since bill S. 1880 is so important please play the important part, vote for it.
RAY MATHEW.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Be a good samaritan, cast a vote for bill S. 1880.
VERA NICHOLS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The voice of the people is the voice of God; the people say vote for bill S. 1880.
NANNIE OAKS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The building of Liberia lies within your vote. Please vote S. 1880.
WILMER HUGHES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Where there is strength there is power. The power is in the bill, S. 1880, please vote for it.
JOEL COBB.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

If you were in my place and I were in yours, I would do you a favor. Vote for bill S. 1880.
JUDGE ANDREW SMITH.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My heart and my prayers are backing the movement. Please back it with your vote S. 1880.
WILLIAM WHITE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Right has always won. We believe that bill S. 1880 is right from the depths of our hearts. Please vote for it.
FLOYD JACKSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Long may our Government prosper. Let us vote for bill S. 1880.
HENRY RILEY.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Unselfish work for others will be shown through your vote for bill S. 1880.
EARL WRIGHT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If we have your cooperation, bill S. 1880 will pass. Vote for it.
MRS. EVAN F. WASHINGTON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are seeking to lift humanity. Please join the band. Vote for bill S. 1880.
MRS. ELLA FULLER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are our brother's keeper. Let's act the same. Vote for bill S. 1880.
MRS. ERNESTINE BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let's act in fellowship. Cast your vote for bill S. 1880.
ROOSEVELT TURNER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Be practical and vote for the material things of life. Vote for bill S. 1880.
JOHNNY LEE RAINES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: When it comes to doing a favor this is your opportunity. Vote for bill S. 1880.
BENNIE WILKIN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To keep democracy spreading through the world our Nation must lead in opening new frontiers. It is important. Vote for bill S. 1880.
MRS. ALICE BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: What our chances are to keep our country great lies in our opening up these new frontiers. Vote for bill S. 1880.
MRS. JESSIE LOUISE BRYANT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

What a friend we have in Jesus and what a friend we have in Washington when you vote for bill S. 1880.
MARGIE CARREER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A thousand minds join me in asking you to vote for bill S. 1880.
MRS. ALBERTA EVANS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please don't forget to vote for bill S. 1880.
LEE WILSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am interested in man's progress. Bill S. 1880 is progress. Vote for it.
JAMES SIMMON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Liberia is a land opportunity for settlers of our country. Please help pass bill S. 1880.
SAM BOWDEN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If you do your part by casting a vote, I will do my part by praying a prayer. Please vote for bill S. 1880.
JERALDINE WHITE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please give your full support to bill S. 1880. We opened Alaska. Now let us open Liberia.
MRS. ROSETTA FISHER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please cast your vote for bill S. 1880. It's a favor bigger than words can tell.
MRS. ALICE MALLET.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As God is the ruler of the universe so is our representative our spokesman. Give your support to bill S. 1880.

SALLIE HALL.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please, your vote for bill S. 1880; it is a favor to one who wants to pioneer.
MRS. ANNIE JOHNSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am doing my best; if you do your best the bill will go through.
NETTIE WEBB.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

HONORABLE SIR: It is my request for you to press passage of bill S. 1880.

Z. M. PATTON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

HONORABLE SIR: May God give you the power to enact bill S. 1880.

BENJAMIN RUSSELL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

HONORABLE SIR: I am in favor of passage of your bill S. 1880.

STANLEY A. DAVIS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

HONORABLE SIR: I am interested in passage of bill S. 1880 early this session.

B. O. WHITE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

HONORABLE SIR: I am encouraging passage of bill S. 1880.

WILLIAM SERRISS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

HONORABLE SIR: Please rush this magnificent bill, S. 1880, for passage.

JOSEPH THOMPSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Please do what you can to pass bill S. 1880.

ORA WARE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Life is a race we all must. A race will be won when bill S. 1880 is passed.
MARY MATHIS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Two thousand words would not show the appreciation given to the passing of bill S. 1880.

MRS. ANN MATHEW.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please give us a break by casting a vote for S. 1880.

W. M. MARSHALL.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As our representative, please cast your vote for bill S. 1880.

ANNIE BOWDEN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The uplift of humanity is to cast a vote for bill S. 1880.

ALICE SPARKMAN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Do me a favor so I can do one for you, vote for the bill S. 1880.

AMOS MCCORKLE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: When we work for one another we are working together. Please vote for bill S. 1880.

LEONARD OAKS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Help us to pass bill S. 1880 by voting for it in United States Senate. Please vote for it.

MARVIN BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Bill S. 1880 is giving the people a chance to keep spreading our way of life. Please vote for it.

WILL COOK.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A thousand words cannot express how much I thank you for a vote to S. 1880.

LUCY MCCORKLE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The height of my ambition is to know that bill S. 1880 has passed. Please give it your full support.

JOSEPH LLOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The strength of a million lies within the hands of the men who vote for the bill S. 1880.

NELLIE SCOTT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let us unite and vote for bill S. 1880.

ETHEL WIGGINS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Be a friend. Cast a vote for bill S. 1880.

MRS. ALICE SIMONS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: All the votes you can get with yours to pass bill S. 1880 will be appreciated.

ELDER I. W. ALBRIGHT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Do all in your power to pass bill S. 1880.

WILLIE FORD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Bill S. 1880 will be passed, Senator, if you will support it for your voters.

MRS. JANIE LU BARNES.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I request early enactment of bill S. 1880.

ROSE WARREN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am requesting passage of bill S. 1880.

JESSIE STOCKETT.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We are sincerely hopeful bill S. 1880 will pass soon.

Mr. and Mrs. C. A. WALTERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am praying that you secure passage of bill S. 1880.

CLARENCE G. THOMAS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 HONORABLE SIR: Please try to have bill
 S. 1880 passed early this year.
 JOHN HENRY BELL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 Thanks for presenting bill S. 1880. Hope
 for its early passage.
 Sincerely,
 JOSEPH WEST.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 HONORABLE SIR: Being interested in bill
 S. 1880 and its passage, I hope for early en-
 actment.
 PERCY CUNNINGHAM.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Give your aid to bill S. 1880.
 It is a chance we long for to colonize Liberia.
 JAFUS BOYD, JR.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: This bill provides the required
 visibilities to enable us to go to Liberia.
 Please vote for it.
 MRS. BLANCHE HOLMES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: My sincere prayers and desires
 is for the passage of bill S. 1880. Please vote
 for it.
 MRS. MYRTLE GANDY.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Let our own actions be good
 ones. Please cast a vote for bill S. 1880.
 CHARLES HICKS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: I want to go to Liberia. Please
 vote in favor of bill S. 1880.
 MRS. LILLIE WADDELL.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: It's a long time since considera-
 tion has been given a minority group, such
 as this opportunity. Vote for bill S. 1880.
 MRS. WILLAMAY JONES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Do unto others as you would
 they do unto you. Vote for bill S. 1880.
 ARCHIE WADDELL.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Bill S. 1880. I am desirous to
 see it passed. Vote for it.
 MRS. MAMIE B. WALKER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: God is for us. If you vote for us
 our hearts will rest at ease. Vote for S. 1880.
 WAVERLY WEBB.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Let us advance in humanity by
 extending democracy to backward areas.
 LOCKETT WALKER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: It will pay for itself many times
 over through commerce and trade. Vote for
 bill S. 1880.
 MRS. HATTIE E. WALKER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: I hope bill S. 1880 will pass.
 Will you please vote for it.
 LAURANCE R. WHITE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Let us look for better fields and
 a greater expansion of our way of life. Vote
 for bill S. 1880.
 ROBERT C. WALKER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Let's vote for bill S. 1880 so
 man's next step in achievement may be un-
 folded. Vote for bill S. 1880.
 AARON BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Let us not sleep but cooperate
 with the President's point-4 program. Vote
 for bill S. 1880.
 RUSSELL PALMER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Let's bring creative power to men
 in backward areas. Vote for bill S. 1880.
 MRS. ESTELLE PALMER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Let's progress and not draw back
 when we lift humanity. Vote for bill S. 1880.
 MRS. HATTIE BELL BROWN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Don't let us down because we
 have not let you down. Vote for bill S. 1880.
 MRS. FLORA MARIE GREEN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: I want you to please cooperate
 with bill S. 1880. Vote for it.
 MELVIN WRIGHT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: From sympathizing friends let's
 back the following bill. Vote for S. 1880.
 LEO GRAVES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Vote for bill S. 1880. We want to
 go to Liberia.
 MARY WILSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: As a voter of our Commonwealth
 I beseech you to do all you can for getting
 bill S. 1880 passed.
 LUCY BLAIR.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Qualified persons appeal for a
 vote. Please cast a vote for bill S. 1880.
 HORACE WELLMAN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Please give your full support to
 pass bill S. 1880.
 MRS. LOUISE WINSTEAD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: Give full support to bill S. 1880
 in getting it passed through the Senate.
 MRS. CATHERINE BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: All I can do for you is vote when
 your time comes. Do the same for me. Vote
 for bill S. 1880.
 LAVENIA MCCORKLE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.
 HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
 DEAR SIR: We believe our Senator will help
 pass bill S. 1880. Please cast your vote for
 its passage.
 EMMETT BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your attention to bill S. 1880 is an opportunity our Government is giving us. Please support the bill.

CORA PEARL BROWN.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Don't deny your voters of this opportunity. Give your vote in the passing of bill S. 1880.

Mrs. ERNESTINE BOONE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please don't forget to vote for bill S. 1880.

LEE WILSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If our Government are happy in opening backward areas, let's back her by voting for bill S. 1880.

JAMES RODGERS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Give the people a break who want to colonize Liberia. Vote for bill S. 1880.

Mrs. CARRIE HODGE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: When the bill S. 1880, is discussed please vote for it. We want to go to Liberia.

HENRY BOONE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: God bless you, Senator, if you cast a vote for bill S. 1880.

SOLOMON ESTELLE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please vote for bill S. 1880. So many would like to pioneer in new areas.

Mrs. IDA BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please vote for bill S. 1880 when it comes before your group.

Mrs. ANNIE BANKS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our chance for colonization of Liberia, west Africa, lies in your support of bill S. 1880.

HERCHEL BOYD.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: God loves a cheerful giver. Give your vote to S. 1880.

Mrs. GERTRUDE RAINES.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The passage of bill S. 1880 is necessary. Please give it your support by voting for it.

JAFUS FRANKLIN BOYD, JR.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are backing you with prayers. Please give your full support to bill S. 1880.

Mrs. LOLA FOSTER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Prayers will do its part, if you will do your part. Please vote for it.

Mrs. ARZULA EVERETT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please open the doors of Liberia by casting a vote for bill S. 1880.

ADELL RICHARDSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please pass bill S. 1880. It is an opportunity for our people.

LLOYD FOSTER.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The bill S. 1880 is passed. The battle is won for opening backward areas.

Mrs. ELIZABETH KAYE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: God is backing us. We are backing you. Give your support to bill S. 1880.

GURGLE HODGE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regards to bill S. 1880, please give it your full support.

Mrs. ROSETTA ELLIOT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To cast a vote for S. 1880 is an open door to Liberia.

WASH ALLEN REODIE.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: An open door to Liberia will be an opportunity for our children of tomorrow. Vote for bill S. 1880.

KATE FRANCIS ELLIS.

PITTSBURGH, PA., January 5, 1950.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My desire is to emigrate to Liberia. Vote for bill S. 1880.

AMZIAH RAINES.

REPEAL OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] for himself and other Senators. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has the floor.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, we have just passed through the Christmas holidays, and one of the fine customs of this season is the sending of greetings to our friends and receiving them from our friends. But, Mr. President, in the last week I have received over 200 Christmas cards with this type of message:

MY DEAR SENATOR: We extend to you the season's greetings: Merry Christmas and happy New Year. Hark the herald angels sing; peace on earth, good will to men—and please give your support to the removal of restrictions on the oleomargarine sale.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, that is a prostitution of the joys and purposes of the Christmas season and is somewhat indicative of the methods being used in the consideration and the attempt to whip up public support for the pending measure.

I came to Washington 17 years ago next March. I understand that this question in its various phases has been debated some 64 times. I personally have heard debates on this question more than 30 times. I did not think there was anything new which could be offered. But yesterday the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] offered a new argument in support of the bill, calling attention to a recent election in the State of Ohio, in which the people of Ohio, exercising their right and privilege as electors, decided in favor of giving permission for the sale of colored oleomargarine. The Senator from Arkansas took great comfort from that. I also call his attention to the fact that the people of Ohio, in expressing their viewpoint at the polls, decided in support of candidate Dewey. Whether in the opinion of the Senator that is a conclusion he supports, I do not know.

The point is that the people of Ohio and the people of Arkansas and the people of Iowa have, and should have, the right to determine what sort of articles they wish to sell in commerce, and to regulate them under the authority

they have, not under an authority imposed upon them by the Federal Government.

I have been astonished, Mr. President, at the misconception which appears in the public press, editorially and otherwise, and also in the broadcasts of news commentators, as to what this issue is. My only purpose in rising at this time and discussing this matter is, if I can do so, to fix the issues which are to be determined here.

The proponents of the bill and the advocates of the sale of yellow oleomargarine say they have a palatable product. They have; it is definitely palatable; I use it frequently, and I like it.

They say they have a wholesome product—and they have. No one questions that.

They say they have a nutritious product filled to the brim with vitamins P, D, Q, and B, V, D, and vitamins of all other kinds. [Laughter.] They have; there is no question about it.

They say they have, and can put on the market, an article which can sell at a price less than the price of butter. They have; there is no question about it.

They say they should have a right to sell their product in an untrammelled way in the market place. There is no question about that, provided they sell it on its merits.

They say it can stand on its own feet, can stand alone on its merits, and should have a right to do so.

Very well; then why do not they go ahead and sell it? They say the taxes on oleomargarine ought to be repealed, and some of them have been; and our substitute measure provides that all of them shall be repealed. That is not the issue. Hundreds of letters which I have received ask me to support a repeal of the excise taxes on oleomargarine. But that is not at issue. There is no Senator on this floor or in this body who will vote at this session for a retention of the taxes on oleomargarine. We say, "Go ahead and sell your product on its merits, which it undoubtedly has. No one is preventing that."

But they say, "Oh, but we want to go ahead and color it."

We reply, "Go ahead and color it; color it pink or red or green; give it all the hues of the rainbow, if you want to."

But they reply, "No, but we want to color it yellow."

Why is that, Mr. President? Is it so that it can stand on its own merits? No.

They say, "We want to color it yellow so that it can usurp the good will and the market butter has built up over scores and scores of years."

Mr. President, there is no other purpose. For what other purpose, I ask my fellow Senators, are advertisements of oleomargarine printed in yellow—as we observe when we pick up a copy of the Saturday Evening Post or of Collier's magazine or of any other national magazine, in which there appear full-page advertisements, printed in yellow, of oleomargarine, and on which there also appear pictures of pastures, with cows peacefully grazing. Why is that done? Is it done so that oleomargarine may

stand on its own merits? No, Mr. President, it is done for the sole and only purpose—and the Senator from Arkansas admitted it yesterday in his very scholarly and able address—of trying to take over a market by deluding and deceiving the people.

Mr. President, I have a formal address which I have prepared, and which I shall deliver if I ever get to it; but at the moment I wish to call attention to this bill. If ever I have seen—and I say this in all kindness—a unique bill, and one almost ridiculous to the point of absurdity, it is the proposal to which we have offered the amendment.

Let me call attention to the provisions of the bill.

The first paragraph reads:

That section 2301 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on oleomargarine) is repealed.

Fine; we are for it; our substitute provides for it.

Next:

SEC. 2. Part I of subchapter A of chapter 27 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the occupational tax on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of oleomargarine) is repealed.

Fine; our substitute proposes to repeal it.

Then what does the bill say?

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that the sale, or the serving in public eating places, of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine without clear identification as such or which is otherwise adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—

Is unlawful? Oh, no. Is punishable under the penalty provisions of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act? Oh, no; not unlawful; but—

depresses the market in interstate commerce for butter and for oleomargarine or margarine clearly identified and neither adulterated nor misbranded, and constitutes a burden on interstate commerce in such articles.

All right; how is anyone going to be punished for a violation of that provision? Will the punishment be under the authority of the penalty provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act? Oh, no. Listen to this statement at the bottom of the page:

SEC. 407. (a) Colored oleomargarine or colored margarine which is sold in the same State or Territory in which it is produced shall be subject in the same manner and to the same extent to the provisions of this act as if it had been introduced in interstate commerce.

Let me digress here to say to the States' rights Democrats from the South that if ever I have seen a bold, bald, inexcusable instance of an attempt to violate States' rights by some sort of regulation within their borders, it is that language. Shades of John C. Calhoun, Alexander Stephens, Kirby Smith, and Sam Houston.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Iowa knows that these provisions were included in an effort, so to speak, to satisfy the complaint which had been made

by the butter interests, and constitute no protection against the sale of margarine in a local sense.

The Senator says he is for the repeal of the taxes. I will go along with the Senator for nothing more than the repeal of the taxes, and will forget about all the rest, if the Senator and his colleagues who oppose the proposed legislation are agreeable to that. My point is that these provisions were included in an effort to satisfy the complaint—which I think was not altogether genuine—that there might be some deception in the local sales, in a restaurant. That is the only purpose of this provision. Personally, the proponents of this measure would be entirely agreeable to go along with a complete repeal of all present legislation on this subject, and nothing more, if the Senator will agree to that.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am very glad that the penitent has come to the rail; but I may remind him that the bill we are considering, of which he is one of the proponents, came to us from the House of Representatives, under the name of Representative FOAGE, of Texas, that it has been considered by the Finance Committee, and reported to the Senate with these provisions. I submit to him that I have never offered them, neither have I had an opportunity to offer them. I do have an opportunity to call attention to their impracticability, their inapplicability, and their utterly ridiculous nature, as I see them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I assume that he would not wish to leave the impression that he would be in favor of an outright repeal of all Federal laws regarding margarine; would he?

Mr. GILLETTE. A repeal of all laws?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of the Federal laws relating to margarine. Would the Senator leave that impression?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is too comprehensive a question. I do not have in my mind at the present time the provisions of all the Federal laws relating to the sale of oleomargarine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am referring only to section 2301; that is the first one, and section 2 of the pending bill. I merely want it to be made clear to the Senate that the Senator is not in favor of the repeal of those laws. Am I correct in that?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes. I call the Senator's attention to our substitute, which in section 6 provides:

REPEAL

SEC. 6. The following sections of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to taxes on colored and uncolored oleomargarine, to special occupational taxes on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of oleomargarine, and to packaging, reporting, and other regulations of oleomargarine) are hereby repealed: Sections 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2313, 3200, 3201 (26 U. S. C., secs. 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2313, 3200, 3201).

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator willing to stand on that provision, and omit the remainder of his substitute?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is all I want to know.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator knows. The question I believe is just as ridiculous as the proposal which the Senator is supporting now in the Senate. Let me go on. If the pending bill should become law, when, and under what circumstances would oleomargarine become subject to a penalty, when, in the State of Arkansas, or in the State of Iowa, or in the State of Texas, or in the State of North Dakota, it is sold in public eating places, whether produced within the State or not? I shall digress to say that, other than this, there is not a penalizing provision in the entire bill. In the first paragraph it is exempted. Section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act contains 12 provisions, each one referring to a violation by misbranding or adulterating; but there is not a single one of the 12 which applies under this bill. The proponents of the bill, recognizing that, did not attempt to work within the penalizing provisions, but said they would add something to it. Moreover, admitting under the old legal plea of confession and avoidance, that there were people who would use it as a means of fraud, the proponents of the bill wanted to avoid the penalty, and so they said, "We will add to section 301, the provision: 'The serving or the possessing in a form ready for serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in violation of section 407 (b).'"

That would bring it within the penalizing provision of section 301 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 407 (b) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. It means that if colored oleomargarine is being sold in Mississippi, whether produced within the State or not, anyone who sells it in a public eating place must post in a public place a notice that can be read, along with the cigarette license, the soft-drink permit, the permit for the selling of beer, and the sanitary code permit of the State, county, or municipality. They should all be displayed so that every customer entering the place would stop to read them. We know the customer will not do it. It is utterly foolish.

Proponents of the bill then do two other things that would exempt oleomargarine from a penalty. They provide that "each separate serving bears or is accompanied by labeling identifying it as oleomargarine or margarine." Yesterday I asked the distinguished Senator from Arkansas what he meant by "labeling." How is it proposed to label oleomargarine that is going to be served to prevent its coming within the penalizing clause? The Senator stated it would be very difficult to make an imprint on the oleomargarine because, by their very nature, butter and oleomargarine are prone to soften, thus obliterating the imprint. The Senator suggested it might be possible to use the label on the plate on which it was to be served. The plate might be made in China, and over the name "Royal Doulton china," or "Wedge-wood china" perhaps there would be imprinted the word "oleomargarine"; or if the oleomargarine were served on a little butter patty, under the patty there would be placed on the plate so the user could clearly see it the word "oleomargarine."

The user would then see that it was oleomargarine before he tried to use it. Can Senators conceive of anything more ridiculous, more impossible of enforcement?

It is further provided, alternatively, that each separate serving thereof shall be triangular in shape. I emphasize, "each separate serving." I called the Senator's attention yesterday to a custom which was formerly more widespread than it is today, of placing a plate of butter on the table along with the plate of potatoes and the plate of meat, and passing it to the guests, letting the guests help themselves. The practice is not so widespread now as it once was, but it is still followed. Does the provision of the bill mean that the oleomargarine shall be put into triangular form when placed on the table, or does it mean that as it is passed each guest shall help himself to it and shall be expected to cut a triangular piece for himself, on pain of subjecting himself to the tax? [Laughter.] I am not joking. I ask, if it were attempted to enforce such a ridiculous provision, whether Federal inspectors would go into the restaurants in Arkansas and into the restaurants in Georgia and Texas, as an army of Federal inspectors, to snoop around and watch to see whether under each little butter patty there was stamped the word "oleomargarine" or to determine whether it had first been cut into triangular form before being used in order that they might file an information under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act? How far would they get? A survey was made in the State of Arkansas, which showed that more than 60 places within the State were violating the State provision against the sale of oleomargarine.

I turn my attention for a moment to States' rights Democrats. I sat in the Senate when we were debating FEPC, the repeal of the poll tax, and similar measures, and I have supported the States' rights Democrats. I have supported the southern Senators. I sat in that particular chair to my right when the Senators would pat me on the back as they went by and say, "Guv, you are a statesman. You are a statesman because you do not believe that the Federal Government has any right to tell Iowa that it cannot make the payment of a poll tax a condition precedent to voting any more than it can say you must make it a condition precedent. You are a hero, Guv. We are for you for standing up with the southern boys." I was here supporting the States' rights Democrats—a Democrat from Iowa, where a States' right Democrat was outside the pale of human decency—because I believed in this measure of local control. I have lived to see brother Senators—and I love them—and brother Representatives—and I know many of them and love them—come here and ask that a Federal law be placed on the statute books to authorize turning loose, if necessary, an army of Federal snoopers in the States to prosecute and convict, if possible, under such preposterous and amorphous language as that proposed, to find them guilty of selling within their own State an article which was permitted to be manufactured and sold.

I did not think I would live to see it. I am disappointed that I have lived to see it. But let us go on.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator remember a dictum of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, in one of the celebrated cases, in which Justice Holmes said, "Abstract considerations have nothing to do with concrete policies"?

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator. I do not recall the passage, but I may say it has extreme applicability to the present situation.

Let us go on with the reference to the Senators who drafted this bill; and I really should have liked to sit with them when they drafted it. Not only did they, as I have said, propose these ridiculous provisions; they went further. Mind you, Mr. President, the only way oleomargarine can be brought under a penalty provision is by subsection (b). But the proponents of the measure added subsection (c), reading as follows:

Colored oleomargarine or colored margarine when served with meals at a public eating place shall at the time of such service be exempt from the labeling requirements of section 403 (except (a) and 403 (f)) if it complies with the requirements of subsection (b) of this section.

There was to be a labeling requirement, or it was to be required that the oleomargarine be cut into a three-cornered piece before serving. It is now to be exempted from the labeling requirement, bringing it under section 403 of the Internal Revenue Code, if it complies with subsection (b). In other words, it is unnecessary to label, as has been said. It is unnecessary to label in any way, if the oleomargarine is served in triangular form. It is a ridiculous proposal. Section 403 is the penalizing provision, which I shall read.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, while the Senator is turning to that section, will he yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not sure whether the junior Senator from Illinois was here a moment ago, but I should not want him to be under the misapprehension that it is the purpose of the Senator from Iowa to protect States' rights. I wanted to call his attention to section 5, on page 4, reading as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the possession, sale, or serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in any State or Territory in contravention of the laws of such State or Territory.

That, in other words, expressly reserves the right of each State to do as it likes about the whole matter. But the point on which the Senator from Iowa is, I think, leaving a false impression, is that the proponents of the measure are proposing Federal laws for the control

of margarine. That creates a completely false impression in the minds of people who are not familiar with the legislation. We did not initiate the legislation. What we are struggling to do is to remove the existing discriminatory laws which have been maintained for 64 years by the persons who take the attitude taken by the Senator from Iowa. I mean the Senator has completely reversed the purposes.

So far as I am concerned, and, I think, so far as those who are proposing the pending measure are concerned, we should be perfectly willing to eliminate every law on the statute books relating to oleomargarine. I want to make that perfectly clear. We are not simply proposing Federal legislation in this field. We already have such legislation, which is completely unjustified. We are seeking to modify the impact of it. I think the Senator should not leave the impression that he is a States' rights man and is seeking to eliminate the Federal influence in this bill. That is not correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. In reply to the Senator from Arkansas, I will say that the junior Senator from Iowa is not seeking to leave the impression that he is a States' rights man. He is asserting that he is a States' rights man.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], from his question, had received a wrong impression as to my position and that of the proponents of this bill.

Mr. GILLETTE. I absolve the Senator from any ulterior purpose. What I have tried to do in my very inadequate way has been to point to the utter absurdity of the language of the bill as it is proposed at the present time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator very clearly left the implication that the Senator from Arkansas is not a States' rights man.

Mr. GILLETTE. If I have left that impression, I apologize, because there have been ample manifestations of the position of my southern friends and colleagues, and I assume there will be other manifestations in the further weeks of the Congress. But I am saying that in the pending legislation, in my opinion, in my judgment, and for the reasons which I have pointed out, and others which I hope to point out, there is a clear support of the right of the Federal Government and its agents to penalize, if they can be brought within the provisions, the people of Arkansas if they do not comply with the provisions as to labeling and as to cutting the product in triangular form.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask the Senator if he would be willing to offer an amendment to strike that particular provision and any other similar provision from this bill?

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator has asked me that question previously. I have no desire to perfect the Senator's bill, because I think it is absolutely ridiculous and absurd. I am joining with 25 of my colleagues in offering a substitute for it. The Senator will recall that on yesterday, when there was a suggestion of cutting the product in triangular

pieces and labeling the plate on which it was served, it was said that it would be almost impossible of enforcement, and the suggestion was made that we might be willing to accept an amendment. That amendment was pending as a committee amendment at the time; and if the Senator wanted it eliminated he had a most glorious opportunity to do so at that time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Arkansas has just made a very interesting proposal, which I think the dairy interests might be inclined to consider very seriously. That is the proposal to eliminate from the books all laws relating to oleomargarine. The first law to be eliminated is that which gives domestic oleomargarine a protection of 22 cents a pound against imported oleomargarine. The next to consider for purposes of elimination would probably be the law which gives producers of oleomargarine the right to fortify it, to put in flavor to make it taste like butter, and particularly the law permitting the use of benzoate of soda or other embalming materials so that oleomargarine can be made to look like butter indefinitely. No doubt there are several other laws which probably could be eliminated from the books and in which the dairy interests might show a great deal of interest.

I hope the Senator from Iowa will consider seriously the proposition of the Senator from Arkansas when he proposes to eliminate all laws on the books relating to oleomargarine.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator. I may say that the esteemed Senator from Arkansas rather anticipated me by quoting the amendment which the Senate Finance Committee put into the bill, which provides as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the possession, sale, or serving of colored oleomargarine or colored margarine in any State or Territory in contravention of the laws of such State or Territory.

Why was that amendment inserted? In the first place, we are authorizing it. In the second place, we are attempting to bring it under the penalty provisions of the law, and in the third place, we strike out the provision put in by the House, which was as follows:

This act shall not abrogate or nullify any statute of any State or Territory now in effect or which may hereafter be enacted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry to interrupt the Senator, but he pointed to the Senator from Texas, and I want to ask the Senator what his attitude would be if the situation were turned around and this were a bill to limit the sale of milk or any other food product. Would he be in favor of it?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly not. I will answer that question categorically.

Mr. CONNALLY. If it referred to milk or any other food product except oleomargarine, would the Senator favor such a bill?

Mr. GILLETTE. I would not favor such a bill. Neither would I favor such a bill with reference to oleomargarine. I would not favor any restriction on any food product excepting a product which is being used to deceive the public, under laws the purpose of which is to permit the public to be defrauded. Yesterday the question was asked, "What about white cotton? What about using rayon as a substitute for white cotton?" No one can object to the sale of oleomargarine anywhere in the United States, provided the States permit it, if it is sold on its own merits. But the producers of it refuse to let it stand on its own merits. They insist on selling it as an imitation of something else, for the purpose of deceiving the public.

The esteemed Senator from Texas, whom I love, shakes his head in disappointment at my temerity in making such a suggestion. But what other purpose is there in the Food and Drug Act? What other purpose is there in any of our protective enactments than to protect the public from mislabeling, misadvertising, and misbranding? Every one of the provisions of section 301 of the act deal with the question of misbranding and misrepresenting to the public. That is where the penalizing provisions are imposed. But because of the fact that there is not a single one which would apply to this situation, an attempt is made to bring it in by means of this abortive proposed legislation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows very well that margarine was made yellow by natural ingredients, but the dairy interests were instrumental in preventing its being made in its natural color. In many parts of the country, in the Senator's own State, at this time of the year every pound of butter is colored in an attempt to deceive the people and to make them believe that the butter was produced in the summer time when it is naturally yellow. The Senator knows that very well. If that line of argument be used, it is just as applicable to butter as it is to margarine, because butter is not naturally yellow in the winter time.

Mr. GILLETTE. Butter is naturally yellow in the winter time. Before I came to Congress I milked 12 cows every morning and every evening, and sold milk and butter. I know a little about the dairy business. Butter is colored, if it is colored, for the purpose of uniformity, and not for the purpose of deceiving the public or misrepresenting the product as being something other than what it is. Of course, when cows are turned out after feeding all winter on dry hay, and they are permitted to eat new green grass, the butter is intensified in color. When the cows are fed on dry feed the butter is lighter in color. Some of the farmers do color it, especially where they have regular customers, in order to maintain uniformity. It is not for the purpose of deceiving the public, it

is for the purpose of maintaining uniformity of the product.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is apparently basing his argument on the pure motives of those producing butter. The fact is the people are deceived into thinking the product they are getting is butter produced by a cow eating green grass which gives it the color. The Senator says, "if it is colored." The testimony in every one of the hearings of the committee leaves no doubt that butter is colored. I do not know why the Senator would say "if it is colored." All the experts from the Butter Institute admitted under cross-examination that it is colored. There is no doubt about that, and I do not think the Senator wants to leave the impression that there is doubt about butter being colored.

The Senator should also make it clear that it is the only product which by special act of Congress is expressly exempted from having the statement made that it is artificially colored, which obviously leaves a doubt in people's minds as to the motives. Why do not those who produce it say on the carton that it is colored for purposes of uniformity? To be frank about it, why do not the producers of butter do as the producers of other commodities do? It is the only commodity which, merely because it has the votes in the Congress, and because it has great numbers of people back of it, imposes its will on the Congress and has itself exempted from proper labeling, a requirement which every other food product must observe.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator in his zeal propounded several questions to me, and I shall have to take them up one at a time. In the first place, he states that butter is colored. There is no question about that. When he says that all butter is colored, he does not state a fact.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say "all butter."

Mr. GILLETTE. When he says that some butter is colored, I agree. When he makes the statement that I am supporting the contention that all dairymen are pure, I must say I am not. Being a dairyman myself, I never claimed purity even for myself. I have referred to two and a half million factories in the United States, small factories on the farms, such as the one on the farm home where I was raised, where my mother made butter and took it to town and sold it to customers every Saturday, 10 pounds. We got 20 cents a pound because of the superior quality of the butter, and that \$2 was used to help dad to pay for a new harvester when he got it.

I know mother did not color the butter. We did not have any color. I know she probably would have if we had had it at that time. But what is said about the coloring is no argument and no answer. We are not trying to deceive anyone. I am merely saying that two and a half million factories throughout the United States are competing with 50 or 60 manufacturers like the Lever Bros., or Jelke, who sell 75 percent of the world product of oleomargarine. When their attempt to usurp the market is going to

interfere with these two and a half million small factories, I am not willing to go to the point of letting them deceive the public.

The pending proposal would eliminate all discriminatory taxes on oleomargarine. I am for that. I am merely saying that I am not willing by my vote to permit one group of people to continue to usurp the market under the guise of legislation that does not carry within it one scintilla of possibility of prosecution and conviction.

The Senator asked if I would be willing to amend the bill. If I were going to support such a proposal, I would certainly amend it so that it would have some teeth in it. It does not even have one rotten molar with which the law could be enforced, not one, and I defy any man supporting the bill to point to how it could be enforced, and how a conviction could be secured.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I am very much impressed with the sublime belief of the Senator from Arkansas that oleomargarine manufacturers would not attempt to have the public believe that their product was very closely related to butter, if not equally as good as or identical with butter. I wonder if the Senator from Iowa or the Senator from Arkansas, or any other Senator, can give an explanation as to why certain west-coast manufacturers sell their product in packages having on the outside a picture of something that looks like a dairy barn. Does not the Senator think it would be much more appropriate to have on the package a picture of a coconut tree, a cotton field, or even a school of menhaden or herring, or possibly a picture of a tub of lard on the outside? Would that not be more informative to the consumer? As a matter of fact, they are not required to tell the consumer what ingredients are used in the manufacture of synthetic butter.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator, but I am afraid he has drawn a wrong conclusion. I am sure that the picture of the dairy cow which is on the package and the pictures of the dairy cow in the oleomargarine advertisement are used simply because of their artistic beauty and have no reference to deception, to make people think they are buying a substitute for butter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think what was stated was not a fact. I do not think any cartons carry any pictures of cows on them, and I am positive that all the cartons containing margarine carry a complete statement of their ingredients, which is not true as to butter.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to hurry on. I have not even gotten to my speech yet.

I have said there was nothing new in the discussion yesterday, but there was. My dear friend, the Senator from Arkansas, was concerned to point out to the dairy people that they were conducting

their business in an uneconomic way. He produced statistics to show that the selling of milk in the form of butter, saving the cream and selling it as butter, brought less return, and that they should sell it as fluid milk in the market place. I was interested in that, and I know that the hundreds of thousands of dairymen in the Middle West will be much interested to learn that they have been conducting their affairs in such a disastrous way, and to learn that they should sell their product as fluid milk.

I would ask the Senator from Arkansas or any other Senator to supplement his statement by showing how it could be done; how, for instance, in the little town in which I live, of six or seven thousand people, with an agricultural county around it, and the limited market those families afford for fluid milk, the producers can sell their surplus milk as fluid milk.

The very thing the Senator referred to, the heavy production of milk in the spring, brings about the necessity for saving the excess production during the time of heavy production, and the adoption of the means these 2,500,000 farmers use of making it into butter, in the main, though not entirely, because some of it goes into cheese.

Again that brings us back to the main purpose of the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, did the Senator ask me a question about a suggestion as to what they might do?

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator made such a suggestion yesterday; but I would welcome a statement from him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If they would spend on ascertaining how to can fluid milk half the money they spend on attempting to maintain the present legislation, I have no doubt they would find a way by which they could keep their fluid milk and sell it when there was a demand later.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I am sure that if the Senator had turned that thought over in his mind a couple of times he would not have given expression to it. A man who would stand on the floor of the Senate and call attention to the money that is being spent by the butter producers, in view of the record of the oleomargarine people, the representatives of Lever and the 50 or 60 men referred to, I do not believe would have referred to it if he had given it mature consideration. That is not what we would expect from the Senator from Arkansas, because he is keen and clear, but often mistaken, as he is now.

I was about to call attention to the restrictions on the sale of oleomargarine. The Senator yesterday pointed with pride to the tremendous growth in the sale of oleomargarine, so that it was the second outlet for cotton. Yet he said it was being restricted.

I wish to call the attention of the Senators from the New England States to the fact that the report of the Bureau of the Census as given to our subcommittee, of which the Senator from Vermont is an honored member, showed that in the city of Manchester butter prices between 1934 and 1948 dropped 40 percent, while the sale of oleomargarine increased 8,150 percent.

Who is objecting to the sale of oleomargarine at a lower price? I know that much of the support for this type of legislation comes from people who say, "We are being prevented by discriminatory taxes from buying an article at a cheaper figure, and our purchasing power is limited. Why can we not buy oleomargarine if we want it?" They have been deluded by the same sort of campaign to which the Senator has referred, heavily financed by oleomargarine interests who want to take over the whole market. No one is preventing people buying oleomargarine if they want it. Nothing would prevent people of the State of Mississippi doing so, under the substitute we propose. I started to comment on that a moment ago, and I wish to refer to it at this time. Listen, you States' rights men, to this language contained in the amendment in the nature of a substitute:

Provided, however, That yellow oleomargarine manufactured or colored within the borders of a State or Territory in which it is to be consumed shall not be subject to the provisions of this act—

Which declares such manufacturing or coloring to be unlawful—

but shall be subject to the laws and regulations of such State or Territory.

That is the language of the substitute. It does not apply the proposed law to oleomargarine manufactured and sold

within the borders of a State. But the language of the bill provides that colored oleomargarine or colored margarine which is sold within the State or Territory in which it is produced, shall be subject to Federal law in the same manner and to the same extent as though it came into the State in interstate commerce, regardless of the laws and regulations of the local State.

There is the difference between the two provisions. Enjoy yourselves, you States' rights men, but I say to you that what you now propose to do will later slap you in the face.

Mr. President, I shall never be a party to the bringing into the States a group of Federal employees in an effort to prevent the people of my State, or of other States, from enjoying something which is perfectly legal and perfectly proper to be sold within my State. I shall never be a party to penalizing my people for doing such a thing.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a sheet in which reference is made, in parallel columns, to the main provisions of the pending Poage bill and the amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, for the information of Senators.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Gillette-Wiley substitute amendment versus H. R. 2023

Subject	Gillette-Wiley	H. R. 2023
Federal taxes and license fees.....	Removes.....	Removes.....
Reporting requirements for manufacturers and wholesalers.....	Would repeal.....	Would not repeal.....
Movement of yellow oleo in interstate commerce.....	Flat prohibition.....	No prohibition.....
States rights.....	States rights protected. Leaves regulation of store sale and eating places solely to the States. Each State is free to ban or not, as its desires and interests dictate.	Interferes with States rights by providing for Federal inspection and regulation of eating places in every city and town of the Nation.
Enforceability.....	Proven constitutional control of interstate shipments could be easily policed. Under Gillette-Wiley provisions, States could settle their own enforcement problems.	Requires expensive inspection and policing of many thousands of eating places (return to Volstead liquor law conditions inevitable).
Food and Drug Act applicability.....	No change.....	Puts jurisdiction of restaurant policing under Food and Drug Administration.
Cost of enforcement.....	Little or no additional cost.....	Estimated cost of effective Federal enforcement ranges to \$60,000,000 a year or more.
Prevention of fraud.....	States are free to protect their consumers from fraud.	Federal Government usurps right of States to regulate sale of oleo without itself having complete power to prevent fraud.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD some figures which appear in a statement I have prepared, and which I do not believe I have covered fully in my extemporaneous remarks.

The effect of oleomargarine on butter sales has been severe. In 1938 our national per capita consumption of butter was 16.4 pounds and of oleo only 2.9 pounds. Five years later, in 1943, only 11.7 pounds of butter per capita were being consumed, as against 3.9 pounds of oleo. In 1948 butter consumption had dropped to 10.2 pounds and per capita consumption of oleo had risen to 6.1 pounds.

More than 2,500,000 dairy-farm families are affected by lost butter outlets for surplus milk. More than 3,500 local creameries and 40,000 other dairy plants

suffer when milk prices are disturbed, and so do their 150,000 employees. The results are felt by local merchants, businessmen, and bankers in every town, village, and hamlet in the United States.

By contrast, five giant corporations sell 68.4 percent of all the oleomargarine produced in the United States. A few months ago their total share of the business was only 61 percent, proving that these five big corporations are growing even larger. Four new oleo plants were opened between January and March 1949.

The purchase of the John Jelke Co. by Unilever, Ltd., of London, England, foreshadows still vaster concentration of oleo sales in the hands of an international cartel. Unilever manufactures 75 percent of all the oleomargarine eaten in Europe, outside of Russia, and about

40 percent of the world's entire consumption. Spokesmen of the company freely state that they plan to make the Jelke Co. the world's biggest oleo producer and to expand its operations to all 48 States.

Obviously, restrictions on the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine have not handicapped free enterprise or restrained the growth of giant corporations.

Mr. President, in that connection it is interesting to note that Unilever—the Lever Bros. Co.—which has taken over the Jelke Co. and handles 75 percent of the sales in Europe and 68 percent of the sales in the United States, is the same concern which went into a United States court and asked for protection against imitation of their product, Lifebuoy soap, through coloring and shaping. The people who invoked the protection of the court of their soap product, because it was being imitated by others in color and shape, are now endeavoring to take over the market for butter.

Mr. President, again I call attention to a matter to which I adverted a short while ago, that in the State of Arkansas a survey made by Benson & Benson of New Jersey of 100 eating places showed that 68 of the 100 were violating the State law against sales of oleomargarine. The proponents of the pending bill, realizing that they are leaving a door open for fraud, have attempted to do what? Have they attempted to close the door? No, but they have attempted to shove the door a little way toward closing, and are leaving a crack through which the law can be violated, and at the same time they are jeopardizing the main outlet for a huge portion of our dairy products.

Mr. President, I am, of course, interested in expanding the market for soybeans, for cottonseed oil, for peanut oil. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which has spent weeks and weeks, and will spend further weeks and weeks in an endeavor to broaden the market for these farm products. But I will not be a party to an attempt to take from a portion of our people the market for their product, butter, nor will I be a party in aiding the Federal Government to infringe on the prerogatives of our local administrative agencies.

Mr. President, I urge all Senators to consider the merits of the two measures now pending before the Senate. There is no question as to the palatability, the cheapness, the wholesomeness, the nutrition of oleomargarine. There is no question that it is a product which has a right to come into the market and be sold on its merits. There is no question that the discriminatory taxes on oleomargarine ought to be repealed. We ask for their repeal. That, however, is not the main question. The main question is the protection or destruction of the outlet for small butter-manufacturing plants. The proponents of the pending bill advocate retention of means by which they can still further destroy the outlet for the small butter-manufacturing plants. I shall vote and work for the expansion of large manufacturing plants, but I shall vote even harder for the preservation and maintenance of

market for our small local manufacturing and marketing plants.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Malone
Anderson	Hill	Maybank
Benton	Hoey	Millikin
Brewster	Holland	Morse
Bricker	Humphrey	Murray
Butler	Hunt	Myers
Byrd	Ives	Neely
Chapman	Jenner	O'Connor
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Darby	Kefauver	Robertson
Donnell	Kern	Russell
Douglas	Kerr	Saltonstall
Downey	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dworthak	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Langer	Sparkman
Ecton	Leahy	Stennis
Ellender	Lehman	Taft
Ferguson	Lodge	Taylor
Frear	Long	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	Lucas	Thye
George	McCarran	Tobey
Gillette	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Graham	McClellan	Watkins
Green	McFarland	Wherry
Gurney	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	Williams
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). A quorum is present.

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, within the last 90 days two catastrophic events have taken place. These are the Soviet success in atomic development, as announced by the President of the United States on September 23, 1949, and the establishment of a Soviet-recognized Communist regime in China. Only in retrospect will we be able to finally determine which event will have the most far-reaching influence. Both have set off chain reactions that have not yet run their full course.

Fifty years of friendly interest on the part of our people and our Government in a free and independent China and the overwhelming contribution made by our Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Pacific during World War II gave us the power, the prestige, and the opportunity for constructive action no western nation had ever before possessed. We could have pioneered in exporting the ideals that inspired men who loved freedom everywhere following our own break-away from colonial status.

All this opportunity has been frittered away by a small group of willful men in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department who had the backing of their superiors.

In Europe where the record of Soviet aims was clearly outlined in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia we finally stood up to communism in

Greece, Turkey, Iran, Berlin, and western Germany.

Knowing that communism thrives on economic and political chaos we gave economic aid through the ECA and with the North Atlantic Pact and the arms-implementation legislation, we have given moral and material support for the protection of western Europe and the Middle East from overt aggression. In that area we have given hope and support to those advancing the cause of a free world of freemen.

Munich certainly should have taught us that appeasement of aggression, then as now, is but surrender on the installment plan. Mr. Chamberlain, Prime Minister of Great Britain 10 years ago, may have sincerely thought that he was gaining "peace in our time" by consenting to the destruction of a free and independent Czechoslovakia by Nazi Germany. We know now that paying such international blackmail only increased later demands that made World War II inevitable.

The men in the Kremlin are as power hungry as the Nazis, and their system is as destructive of human liberty as was Hitlerism with which they were bedfellows while Poland was being dismembered in 1939. They have, however, learned some new techniques.

Communism is destructive of human liberty everywhere in the world. It is no less destructive in China or Korea than it is in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, or Bulgaria. The pattern may differ slightly. In Poland the opposition leader, Mikolajczyk, was forced to flee; in Bulgaria Petkov was hanged; in Rumania the King was given a 2-hour ultimatum to change the government regardless of the constitution; in Czechoslovakia Masaryk's life was forfeited when it became apparent that coalition with communism would not work.

A Chinese official put it clearly by saying to me recently that there can be no real coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the tiger.

The President's state of the Union message of January 4 was notable for its silence on the question of China. In what we hope will be a free world of freemen does the administration have less concern with human liberty in Asia than it does in Europe? On what basis does the administration write off freemen in China?

Let me reread the cold type of the President's message to the Congress:

While great problems still confront us, the greatest danger has receded—the possibility which faced us 3 years ago that most of Europe and the Mediterranean area might collapse under totalitarian pressure. Today the free peoples of the world have new vigor and new hope for peace.

Why no concern regarding the 400,000,000 people of China who have been dragged behind the iron curtain? International communism has already gained more in manpower and resources in Asia than it has lost in Europe, and it is on the march to even greater victories.

At a press conference this morning, the President made it clear that he backs the Far Eastern Division and Acheson

policy of stopping further military aid to the Republic of China.

In Europe we have had a foreign policy in which the Republicans and the Democrats have contributed to the initiation and formulation of doctrines that are understandable. In the Far East there has been no bipartisan foreign policy. The Republicans in Congress have not been consulted in the moves leading up to the bankrupt policy which now stands revealed in all its sorry detail. The administration, and it alone, has the full responsibility for the debacle which has taken place on the continent of Asia and which day by day and hour by hour is endangering the future peace of the world and the security of this country.

As late as December 23, 1949, the State Department sent a memorandum to its overseas personnel in which they gave a clear indication that the defeatist attitude the administration has had in the past in relation to the Far East still continues.

On January 3 the wire services carried extracts of the State Department document circulated for the information of Department personnel. On the same day I requested by telephone to Under Secretary of State Webb and by letter to Secretary Acheson that a copy of the document be sent to me as a member of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate.

I was informed by Under Secretary Webb that the document was classified and the request to forward a copy could not be complied with at the time, but that the matter would be discussed further in the Department.

Quoting now from the wire-service report:

Formosa has no special military significance.

It said there are groups in the United States "who are inclined to be critical of the United States for failure to act to prevent the loss of the island to the Communists." This is "largely because of a mistaken popular conception of its strategic importance to United States defense in the Pacific," the document added.

This raises the following serious questions, to which the Congress and the American people are entitled to full and frank answers:

First. Was the American commander in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur consulted relative to Formosa's strategic importance before the State Department came to this strange conclusion?

Second. Was Admiral Radford, naval commander in the Pacific, consulted on the strategic importance of the island?

Third. Was Secretary of National Defense Johnson consulted on the strategic importance of Formosa to United States defense in the Pacific and does he concur in these State Department views?

Fourth. Is there some State Department committee now determining the strategic defense needs of the Nation and are there representatives on said committee from the Far Eastern Division which has been responsible for our bankrupt policy in China? Who are the members constituting such a committee and upon whose reports did they arrive at such conclusions?

Fifth. Were the members of the National Security Council advised of the December 23 memo when they met to consider the far eastern situation on December 29?

Sixth. If Formosa and free China were already written off on December 23, who were the State and Defense Departments trying to fool by sending Dr. Jessup on a slow boat to China and announcing that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were going out to consult with General MacArthur in February? Are both of these trips intended to be post mortems rather than consultations?

Seventh. Has the Defense Establishment or the State Department asked for or received the views of General MacArthur or Admiral Radford on the strategic importance of Formosa? If not, why not? If such views have been received, will the Secretary of State bring them to the Foreign Relations Committee when it meets in executive session next Tuesday? If not, why not?

We stood up to communism in Europe and took substantial risks in doing so in Greece, Turkey, and Berlin. Certainly for the faint-hearted the putting into operation of the Berlin airlift presented much greater risks than giving aid to the legal government of China to enable them to hold the islands of Formosa and Hainan. During the airlift we were flying our planes across territory controlled by one of the great military powers of the world. This Government supported the Berlin airlift at a cost of \$254,568,800. This was not the only cost, for accidents took the lives of 31 of our men. Nevertheless, had we backed down in Berlin the Soviet Union today would have that city firmly within its grasp and might even have western Germany, if not all of western Europe. Certainly the yielding to international blackmail then would have increased the demands and made more arrogant the men in the Kremlin as an earlier yielding to Hitler at Munich increased his demands.

Our bankrupt policy has taken us to such a low point that prior to his return to the United States our Ambassador, Leighton Stuart, was confined to the Embassy compounds for weeks by the Communists. A consular official was beaten up by the Red police in Shanghai. Our consul general, Angus Ward, was restricted to the compound in Mukden for a year and more recently thrown into a common jail. Our military attaché at Nanking, General Soule, has been trying for over 4 months to get out of the Communist area and has not had any success to date.

William C. Smith, chief electrician's mate, United States Navy, of Long Beach, Calif., and Elmer C. Bender, sergeant, United States Marine Corps, of Cincinnati, Ohio, have been held captive for over 13 months. Yes; we have waited for the dust to settle, and the American people can now see the wreckage of the position once held by this great Nation in the Far East.

Our long-standing far eastern policy was first compromised at Yalta. We gave to the Soviet Union vital rights in Manchuria which were not ours to give. It was done without the consent or approval of the American Congress or the

American people. It was done in violation of the open-door policy of John Hay and of Woodrow Wilson's concept of "open covenants, openly arrived at." The Yalta agreement made Soviet domination of Manchuria and other border provinces inevitable. It made possible Chinese Communist domination of the balance of continental China and has opened the door to bringing the entire continent of Asia, with more than a billion people and vast resources, into the orbit of international communism. Sitting with our American delegation at Yalta was Alger Hiss.

Following VJ-day the representatives of our Department of State persistently tried to get the Government of the Republic of China to form a coalition with the Communists. When they refused we placed an embargo against the shipments of any arms or ammunition to the legal government of the country while during those same months the Soviet army of occupation in Manchuria, as the result of the Yalta agreement, was turning over to the Communist forces large amounts of captured Japanese war stocks.

Like a person with a bad conscience, the State Department on August 6 released the China white paper. All the blame was placed on the National Government, then with its back to the wall. It was apparently issued with the hope that our own sorry part and share of responsibility might be overlooked.

That the National Government of China made mistakes, has had more than their share of Benedict Arnolds, and men who betrayed their trust needed no underscoring from us in the way and at the time it was done. Our own history also has examples of men who have betrayed their trust from Cabinet members down to ward bosses. We have also been plagued with racketeers, highwaymen, and 5-percenters at various times.

The basic objective the United States should have kept constantly in mind was to preserve a free, independent, united non-Communist China. In the postwar illness of that nation we prescribed that the strychnine of communism be taken. The State Department having contributed greatly to the Chinese disaster, still proclaims that we must follow a hands-off policy, or that we must wait for the dust to settle, or we must investigate some more. Are they preparing for a post mortem rather than a consultation?

Had China been a former enemy, like Japan and Germany, we would have been giving large amounts of supervised material help and sending many of our ablest military and civilian leaders to stabilize her currency, improve her economy, rebuild her cities, feed her people, and protect her from Communist aggression. But the State Department policy has been to abandon free China, our wartime ally and friend, to the vultures of international communism.

In and out of Government one hears the argument that the National Government of China still has a reserve of from \$100,000,000 to \$200,000,000 left and that they should use that rather than expect help from the United States.

Any such policy would result in the complete collapse of Chinese Taiwan or Formosa currency, for without gold or

dollar backing it would have little value. A good job has been done to date in stabilizing this currency.

Britain has gold reserves of \$1,500,000,000, according to Chancellor of the Exchequer Cripps, and has been receiving our aid. Does the administration have one yardstick for Europe and another for China? Are the Chinese to be required to use every ounce of gold?

In a very well-written article in the January 7 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, Joseph Alsop has this to say about State Department excuses as contained in the China white paper:

But there is also one carefully concealed defect in the State Department argument. If you have kicked a drowning friend briskly in the face as he sank for the second and third times, you cannot later explain that he was doomed anyway because he was such a bad swimmer. The question that must be answered is not whether the Chinese did their best to save themselves, which they most certainly did not. The question is whether we did our best to save China.

The answer to this question is contained in the strange, still secret inner history of our China policy. And this true history for which the State Department could find no room in all the 1,054 pages of the white paper may be simply, if grimly, summarized:

Throughout the fateful years in China, the American representatives there actively favored the Chinese Communists. They also contributed to the weakness, both political and military, of the National Government. And in the end they came close to offering China up to the Communists, like a trussed bird on a platter, over 4 years before the eventual Communist triumph.

We have been getting much misinformation about Formosa. Governor Chen Cheng, who was the executive head of Formosa, otherwise known as Taiwan when I was there, had done an outstanding job. Considerable progress had been made in land reform, increase in agricultural and industrial production, and stabilization of the Taiwan currency.

There was no visible indication of insurrection or fear of it on the island. I went about the city of Taipei both at night and in the daytime without either Chinese or American escorts. Frankly, I felt safer there than I did later in the Philippines. There were fewer police or armed soldiers doing police duty than will be seen today in most western European nations, with the exception of Great Britain.

The Governor drove about without any police or military escort. He did not act like a man who feared either revolution or an attempt on his life.

The new civilian Governor, K. C. Wu, is a graduate of Princeton. He has had an excellent record as an administrator, as mayor of Shanghai, and as wartime mayor of Chungking.

Gen. Sun Leih Jen, the ground force commander on Formosa, is also in charge of their training centers which I visited. He is a graduate of the Virginia Military Institute. I did not meet an American officer who had had experience in China and who is now in this country or overseas who did not speak in the highest terms of Gen. Sun Leih Jen. The morale of the men is excellent. The training program is very good. They do lack a sufficient supply of arms and ammuni-

tion for defense against the ultimate assault upon the island.

The people of Formosa are ably represented by a provincial legislature. Governor Wu has broadened his administration and consults with the representatives of the people of the island.

In meeting with acting President Li Tsung-jen, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Premier Yen, General Pai Chung-hsie, and the other responsible leaders of the Republic of China, I found no difference of opinion as to the importance of holding Formosa, Hainan, and the smaller islands, and without exception they indicated they would welcome supervision of such aid as we might send them in the same way it is supervised in Greece and in Korea.

Though there are some in the State Department who have been willing to encourage a division within the non-Communist forces of China when we should be encouraging them to pull together instead of apart, I can state that there is no rift at the present time between the acting President Li Tsung-jen and the Generalissimo.

The weakness of free China may now be her strength. By now all the Benedict Arnolds, the band-wagon jumpers, the faint of heart, and the opportunists have departed. Those who are left are determined to preserve a free, independent, non-Communist Republic of China with our help if possible, without it if necessary.

It is my firm belief that, despite the Far Eastern Division, despite the Secretary of State and the President, the Republic of China continues to have the good will and prayers of the American people in the struggle against communism.

It is a sad commentary that Britain, which itself was in such a desperate plight after Dunkerque, which joined us in complaining of Mussolini's stab in the back when France was down but not quite out, should now be contemplating abandoning the Republic of China and giving recognition, aid, and comfort to the Communists who are so closely allied with the same international Communist conspiracy that threatens human freedom in Europe.

Like Mr. Chamberlain at Munich, there are some in this country and in Great Britain who believe that by appeasing the Communists they may change their way of life. This is naive, and such a viewpoint is dangerous to the peace of the world and the security of this country.

First, the Communists will not be satisfied with mere de facto recognition. That will merely be the opening wedge for full de jure approval. When that happens, China's seat in the United Nations and on the Security Council becomes a Communist one. Every Chinese embassy and consulate in this and other western nations will become centers of Communist espionage and fifth-column activity as in the case of similar Soviet establishments. At the peace conference with Japan, the Soviet bloc will have another voice and vote to help destroy the job Gen. Douglas MacArthur has so ably done in that country.

If or when the British or the United States give them full recognition, the Chinese Communists will then consider it unfriendly unless their economic rehabilitation is financed. Such action would, of course, also increase their war potential, for electric-power development, railroads, mines, ports, and factories are important in both peace and war. The United States is the only nation capable of such financing.

Are we to be called upon to pay out substantial sums to help stop communism in Europe while financing communism in Asia—and with serious budget problems of our own? Are we to give arms and guaranties to western Europe to save that area from going behind the iron curtain while we or they accelerate the spread of communism in Asia?

It is my judgment that history will record the recognition of Communist China as being as great a betrayal of human freedom as was the pact of Munich.

I am pleased that the United States was not a participant in the Munich Pact with Great Britain. If other nations want to take that responsibility, let them do it with their eyes open. They cannot for long play both sides of the street.

Since the time the Government of China refused our suggestion to form a coalition with the Communists, the policy of the State Department has been to divide rather than to unite the non-Communist elements in that country.

It was strongly indicated through Americans holding official positions who were in China that no help could be expected while Chiang Kai-shek remained President. After he retired, the new President, Li Tsung-jen, fared no better.

The Far Eastern Division of the State Department has had no intention, in my opinion, of helping the non-Communist government of the Republic of China survive. Since it refused to collapse when they predicted it would some 4 years ago they have been more interested in saving face than they have been in saving freedom.

No group could so operate in the Far Eastern Division without the approval of the Secretary of State and no Secretary of State could follow such a policy without the approval of the President of the United States. The ultimate responsibility is there. It cannot be otherwise under our constitutional system.

But the American people should know that when the last desperate negotiations were going on, before the Yangtse River line was crossed, it was the hope of moderate Chinese elements that if a modus vivendi could be worked out with the North China Communists the troops on both sides could be demobilized except for internal security purposes, and the soldiers returned to their farms. The Communists insisted on maintaining an army of over 3,000,000 men under arms. This convinced even the moderate Chinese that this could only be for the purpose of aggression against southeast Asia or for war against the West.

There are some American and British firms that are today sending oil and other supplies to the Communist regime

which strengthens it in the effort to destroy what remains of the Republic of China. I well remember, as my colleagues no doubt do also, that there were firms, with State Department approval, which supplied scrap iron and oil to Japan in 1939, 1940, and 1941. It was used against our friends in China and ultimately against the American Battle Fleet at Pearl Harbor. While at Pearl Harbor 8 years after December 7, 1941, I visited the wreck of the *Arizona*, which is now on the bottom of Pearl Harbor. In her hull there are still 900 American sailors. Commercial transactions paid in blood money should not set our foreign policy.

I have been deeply shocked by what I have found in the Pacific. On my responsibility as a Senator of the United States, I say to the Senate that we are far weaker in the Pacific today, 90 days after the Soviet atomic development and the Chinese debacle, than we were on the eve of the Pearl Harbor attack 8 years ago. If Formosa gets into unfriendly hands our defense Japan-Okinawa-Philippines is pierced and the Pacific coast may have to become our first line of defense.

For that to happen with the full approval of the people of the United States is one thing. For it to take place without the full facts being laid before them is quite another. Already there are those in Washington who advocate moving some of our large industries out of the States of Washington, Oregon, and California. If we are to make the Pacific coast our outpost line, this is understandable.

I do not favor such a concept when with a proper consideration of the importance of the Pacific basin and with Alaska, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines properly defended and in friendly hands, we will then have the bases for a striking power with which to discourage any potential aggressor nation from taking the calculated risk of attacking us in this age of the airplanes and the atom. The administration's arms-implementation bill allocated 98 percent to Europe and 2 percent to the Pacific. This did not make sense to me when it was done, and it does not make sense to me now.

It is long past the time when the Government of the United States must give to the Pacific region the attention it deserves. It is, of course, of vital importance that western Europe with its great industrial complex and its western civilization not fall into Communist hands. It is no less important that nations containing more than a billion people in Asia not become part of the Soviet orbit. The future peace of the world and the security of this Nation may well depend upon what happens in the Far East while most of our attention is being diverted to Europe.

The question is asked "Can anything be done at this late date?" I believe that it can. While desperate, the situation is not more desperate than it was at the time of Dunkerque or Valley Forge.

First, of course, we need a foreign policy in the Far East. We have none there today. As a basis for such a foreign policy, I suggest the following:

First. That we make clear that we have no intention of recognizing the Communist regime in China at this time nor in the immediate future and that we make known to the powers associated with us that we do not look with favor upon such recognition by others.

It is of course not sufficient merely to delay our own recognition if, with a wink of the eye or tongue in cheek the State Department leaves doubt in the minds of others as to the course of action we may pursue.

Second. That we have a major shake-up in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department. We cannot expect to get inspired leadership for a new policy in the Far East from those who have been receivers of the bankrupt policy we have been following.

Third. Our policy itself, of course, will have to be set by our constitutional officers, the President, his advisers, and the Congress. Once we have a foreign policy there is great need for it to be coordinated in both its economic and defense phases. As coordinator, either Gen. Douglas MacArthur or some other comparable figure should be selected so that in that area of the world the right hand will know what the left is doing.

Fourth. We should give supervised aid to the legal Government of China in the same way we gave it to the legal Governments of Greece and Korea when they were threatened by communism. I have never favored giving unsupervised assistance. A mission headed by a man of the caliber of General Wedemeyer could supervise the requests for aid, be sure that the Chinese Government was properly training the troops in the use of equipment, and make certain from a logistical point of view that the supplies were received at the points where they were needed.

Fifth. Unfreeze the remaining ECA funds that are available for use in non-Communist China. Much could be done to bolster the economy of Formosa and Hainan Islands with the \$106,000,000 remaining unexpended. On both of those islands there is a very fine joint Chinese rural-rehabilitation program which should be continued and enlarged, as well as other steps that would strengthen the civilian morale behind the defending troops. The funds and the authority are there until February 1. It only needs implementation by the President.

Sixth. Make use of the \$75,000,000 authorized and appropriated by the Congress for aid in the immediate area of China. Even this relatively small amount in the arms-implementation bill, if promptly and effectively used, could increase greatly the capacity to resist and strengthen the morale of those who want to maintain a non-Communist Republic of China. If there is a will to help there is also available excess equipment in addition to the \$75,000,000 amount.

Seventh. Strengthen the American Navy in the Far East. The addition of at least two carriers, and possibly three, would do much to restore confidence in that part of the world. Just as the visit of American vessels to Greece and Turkey while the war of nerves was at its

height, restored confidence in that area of the world 2 years ago. Even the executive department now realizes there has been an overdraft in our Pacific defenses.

Eighth. Make it clear that this Government will not sit back for more than a year and do nothing but send a series of notes when people representing this Government are illegally held by the Communist regime in China. Certainly, until they are all released we should undertake to see to it that no traffic was permitted into or out of Communist-held ports. They would have the choice of releasing American personnel or finding that they could not be strengthened in their war efforts through their seaports.

If we use the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia there is no foreign foe we need fear, there is no domestic problem we cannot solve.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a dispatch in the December 23 memorandum by the State Department to its representatives overseas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOKYO.—The United States State Department has notified its attachés that the loss of Formosa, island redoubt of the Chinese Nationalists, to the Communists was to be anticipated.

The Department said the public must be sold on the idea that the island is of no strategic value in order to prevent the loss of prestige at home and abroad.

This is "largely because of a mistaken popular conception of its strategic importance to United States defense in the Pacific," the document added.

"The loss of the island is widely anticipated, and the manner in which civil and military conditions there have deteriorated under the Nationalists adds weight to the expectation," it said.

The fall of Formosa, it continued, would threaten a loss of prestige by the United States at home and abroad "to the extent that we have become committed in the public mind to hold it.

The fall, it continued, also would threaten damage to the morale of other nations, "particularly in the Far East, which are disturbed by Communist gains and fear its possible further advances."

The document said Formosa—politically, geographically, and strategically—is a part of China and "in no way especially distinguished or important."

"Politically and militarily it is a strictly Chinese responsibility," the document said. "It is true that the technical status of the island remains to be determined by the Japanese peace settlement, but the Cairo agreement and Potsdam declaration and (Japanese) surrender terms of September 2, 1945, looked to its return to China, and the United States facilitated its take-over by Chinese troops shortly after VJ-day.

"United States public opinion has concerned itself primarily with the question of the island's strategic importance; there has been an insistent demand from a few sources for military action by the United States, but it has not assumed significant proportions."

The document said that all available material should be used "to counter false impressions" that the retention of Formosa

would save the Chinese Government, and that its loss would damage seriously the interests of either the United States or of other countries opposing communism.

"Without evidencing undue preoccupation with the subject," it continued, "emphasize as appropriate any of the following main points:

"Formosa is exclusively the responsibility of the Chinese Government. Formosa has no special military significance."

Under the latter point the document mentioned that Formosa is "only approximately 100 miles off the China coast," that other potential objects of Communist aggression are closer to points on the Chinese mainland than Formosa, and that "China has never been a sea power, and the island is of no special strategic advantage to the Chinese Communist armed forces.

"In the areas of insistent demand for United States action, particularly in the United States itself, we should occasionally make clear that seeking United States bases on Formosa, sending troops, dispatching naval units, or taking any similar action would—

"(A) Accomplish no material good for China or its Nationalist regime.

"(B) Involve the United States in a long-term venture producing at best a new area of bristling stalemate and at worst possible involvement in open warfare."

Those receiving the document were cautioned to "avoid" speculation which would show "undue concern with whether the Nationalists can hold the island," references which would indicate "strategic significance or that the island is a political entity," and "statements that Formosa's final status is to be determined by the Japanese peace treaty."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed a tabulation I have received from the United States Air Force showing the total cost of the Berlin airlift.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Air Force—Estimated cost of Operation Vittles, June 26, 1948, through Sept. 3, 1949

Item of cost:	Estimated cost ¹
Civilian personnel.....	\$27,932,700
Aircraft fuel and oil.....	26,749,100
Aircraft maintenance matériel.....	21,500,800
Communications equipment.....	20,000
Civilian 1,000-hour inspection.....	23,084,700
Subsistence.....	7,246,100
Clothing and equipage.....	1,478,900
Transportation of things.....	5,966,200
Engineer field operations.....	1,480,900
TDY, per diem and travel.....	384,900
Troop movements.....	869,400
Pay of the Air Force.....	48,062,200
Commercial communications.....	41,400
Subtotal.....	164,817,300
Reserve (for costs of terminating the operation and inventories).....	63,856,200
Aircraft wrecked (23 C-54's and 2 R5D's at \$310,000; 8 C-47's at \$110,000; and 1 C-82 at \$442,000).....	9,072,000
Depreciation of aircraft (based on 10,321 hours life, no salvage value).....	16,823,300
Grand total.....	254,568,800

¹Reflects actual operating cost through July 31, 1949; estimated operating cost Aug. 1 to date and estimate for all other costs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point a letter addressed to me under date of December 31, 1949, by Hon. Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., December 31, 1949.
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your request for my views on the China situation.

There is merit in the contention that the continuous pressures upon the anti-Communist National Government of China, beginning in 1943, to take the Communists into that Government contributed to the break-down of prestige and strength of Chiang Kai-shek, and the encouragement of Mao Tse-tung. Despite all this, your question still remains. What to do next?

It is my strong belief that we should not recognize the Communist Government of China; that we must continue to recognize and support the National Government; that we should, if necessary, give it naval protection to the possessions of Formosa, the Pescadores, and possibly Hainan Islands.

Among many reasons are:

- (1) A wall against communism in the Pacific;
- (2) The defense of Japan and the Philippines;
- (3) The prevention of the Chinese legations and consulates in the United States (and such other countries as agree with us) becoming nests of Communist conspiracies;
- (4) The prevention of another Communist permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, with its dangerous implications to that body;
- (5) The dangers of Chinese Communist participation in formulating peace with Japan;
- (6) By maintaining at least a symbol of resistance, we would have a better basis for salvation of southeastern Asia; and
- (7) There would be at least a continued hope of sometime turning China in the paths of freedom again.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD a cablegram dated November 20, 1949, which I sent to the President of the United States from Taipei, Taiwan—Formosa.

There being no objection, the cablegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAIPEI, TAIWAN, November 20, 1949.
President HARRY TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge that notes of protest in Angus Ward case be implemented by action that will be understood by the law-abiding nations of the world.

First, I suggest we notify Chinese Communists via Voice of America, with information copy of broadcast to Soviet Embassy in Washington, that unless Ward and all other civilian and military personnel of the United States are released and returned to our jurisdiction within 48 hours our Government will institute an effective sea and air blockade along the entire coast line now held by Chinese Communists. Second, inform United Nations of our contemplated action and invite other member nations to join in action to restore respect for international law and order. Third, make it clear that while we welcome other law-abiding nations sharing the responsibility we are prepared, alone if necessary, to make the air and sea blockade

effective against commercial ships and planes of all sizes and all nationalities. Fourth, if our responsible commanders in the Pacific do not at the moment have sufficient vessels or planes in the immediate area to carry out their mission there are plenty in Fleet and Air Reserve status to further implement what we do have in the Far East and the Pacific. If we continue to let Ward and others to be held as hostages by international blackmailers without more than words on our part we will lose what standing we have left in this important part of the world and our own self-respect as well.

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a letter I received under date of December 30, 1949, from the Economic Cooperation Administration showing their estimate of the balance of the China economic aid funds available to be \$106,100,000.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 30, 1949.
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In accordance with your request for the present balance of funds available for the purposes of the China Aid Act of 1948, as extended by section 12 of Public Law 47 (81st Cong.), I am sending you the enclosed table which shows both the present unobligated balance of these funds and additional funds expected shortly to be made available by the reduction of certain outstanding procurement authorizations.

The procurement authorizations which will be reduced were among those issued for commodities such as cotton and rice that were programed for delivery to the Chinese mainland when, as the result of the fall, first of Shanghai and later of Canton, it became impossible to deliver these commodities to their destination. Appropriate action was taken to halt procurement, or in the case of goods already purchased or shipped, to divert them from their original destination and dispose of them by sale. Parenthetically, the greater part of the reductions which resulted from the fall of Shanghai and Canton has already been completed, and is reflected in the present unobligated balance.

The total of funds available for obligation will, of course, be reduced by any procurement authorizations issued between now and February 15, 1950. Current shipments of fertilizer and small amounts of cotton, however, are against outstanding procurement authorizations and will not further reduce the balance.

If there is any further information you wish on this subject, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Deputy Administrator.

ECA China aid program—Estimate of available funds

	Millions of United States dollars
Unobligated balance, Dec. 22, 1949—	94.5
Less: Transfer to State Department for Chinese student aid, Public Law 327, 81st Cong.—	4.0
	90.5
Estimated additional deobligation of funds—	15.6
Estimated balance of funds available—	106.1

BREAK-DOWN OF ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL DE-OBLIGATION OF FUNDS

	Millions of United States dollars
Unused balances in outstanding procurement authorizations—	13.0
Proceeds from sales of diverted commodities—	1.5
Proceeds from claims against shippers—	1.1
Total—	15.6

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point a press dispatch from the Associated Press which appeared in the Washington Post on January 4, 1950, showing that Sir Stafford Cripps says that the British gold reserve is now \$1,500,000,000.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH GOLD RESERVE GAINS \$100,000,000

LONDON, January 3.—Britain has reversed the ruinous drain on her gold and dollar reserves since devaluation of the pound, an informed source said today.

The reserve fund which had fallen to \$1,404,000,000 on September 30, 12 days after devaluation, has jumped nearly \$100,000,000 to \$1,500,000,000, the informant said.

The news, which is expected to be announced officially Wednesday by Sir Stafford Cripps, Chancellor of the Exchequer, increased the likelihood of an early general election.

Prime Minister Attlee could now call an election and point to the figures as proof that the economic situation is better and that Britain is over the hump.

If he delays, the recovery trend might be reversed. Already the cost of living is on the rise and is likely to go still higher as the result of the increased cost of importing food from dollar countries. Steep increases could affect the Government's popularity with the British laboring man.

Attlee's 5-year term is up at the end of July, and he must call a general election before then.

Also, other members of the sterling area—most of the Commonwealth countries, Burma, Iraq, and Iceland—have stepped up their campaigns to earn more dollars. They cheapened their money the same time Britain did. Their dollar earnings go into the British reserve fund, a common pool over which Britain presides as banker.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask to have printed an item which appeared on page 4 in Labor's Monthly Survey for October-November, a publication issued by the American Federation of Labor, under the heading "Will peoples of the Far East lose their freedom?" I ask to have the item printed in its entirety.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL PEOPLES OF THE FAR EAST LOSE THEIR FREEDOM?

The Communist military conquest of China, now almost complete, is of immense consequence to all freedom-loving people. On the maps on page 5, the gray area shows the territory taken over by Communist armies under Soviet guidance since January 1947. On the November 1949 map, arrows show the present Communist drive to complete the conquest of China, and to penetrate and take over other countries to the south and east. Their method in these countries is to stir up discontent, promise the people great benefits under a so-called "workers'

democracy," get control of unions, infiltrate the government and military forces, with the final goal of seizing complete control. In practically every country of the Far East Communist cells are at work, under the Kremlin's direction. The Communist conquest of China immensely strengthens the Communist movements throughout this entire area. The map on page 7 shows the Far East and its resources. Communist movements are at work in India, Burma, Indochina, Indonesia, the Philippines, Japan, the South Korean Republic, and elsewhere.

This area is immensely important to the entire world. These countries, overshadowed by Russia on the north and stretching from Pakistan on the far west to (but not including) Australia on the southeast, cover a land area almost four times that of United States of America and contain more than half the world's entire population. Seven times as many people live there as in United States of America. A longing for freedom and self-government has been growing among these people and in the last few years great strides toward independence have been made. In 1939, all of these countries except China, Japan, and Siam—that is, countries in which 570,000,000 people live today—were part of the British, French, Dutch, and Japanese empires. Today nearly all these peoples (537,000,000) are free and independent. India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma, with their 428,000,000 people, were part of the British Empire and today are independent dominions or countries; Indonesia, with 69,000,000, was part of the Dutch Empire and today is a free nation; the Philippines, with 20,000,000, belonged to United States of America and is now independent; South Korea, with 21,000,000, was temporarily part of the Japanese Empire and is now again a free republic. Only some 33,000,000 people, in Indochina (French), Malaya and North Borneo (British), and New Guinea (Dutch and British), are still under protectorates of foreign powers. This progress toward self-government is truly remarkable.

Most of the people of these countries live under the most primitive conditions. The majority cannot read or write, so that information must be taken to them by word of mouth. Newly formed governments, lacking experience and military strength, find it difficult to deal with the Communist cells fomenting revolution and armed uprisings among their people. So the area offers a fertile field for Communist activities, which are intensified as the conquest of China proceeds. Promises of great benefits from the "workers' democracy" sound inviting to workers with such low living standards, and they cannot know what other millions have learned—that these Communist promises are false and that those who swallow the Communist bait end in slavery, poverty, and the police state controlled by Moscow.

To help these people raise their living standards and keep their freedom is an immediate responsibility, not only for the United States but for other free peoples. Otherwise they will fall victim to the Kremlin's imperialist drive.

The rich resources of this region provide the means for raising living standards there and are also vital to the entire world as raw materials. The map on page 7 shows for each country the resources which are most important in world trade. By exchanging these products for textiles, clothing, machinery, etc., from industrial countries these people are improving their living standards and can greatly increase their progress in the years ahead. They would be impoverished if this trade were broken off. On the other hand, industrial countries which send them manufactured goods cannot do without the raw materials produced there. For some materials, such as tin and tungsten, the world's main resources are in this region. For each country the map shows in bold face those products which are vital or indispensable in

world trade and for which that country is the main far eastern source; in light face are shown other important products.

These materials are of great strategic importance to the United States. For instance, tungsten is indispensable for the high-speed tools on which mass production depends; 80 percent of our supply comes from China. The region where the word "tungsten" appears on the map contains the world's main resources; adequate supplies do not exist anywhere else. This region will fall into Communist hands if the Chinese Nationalist Government is defeated. Tin is essential because there is no other unbreakable material which can replace it for preserving food—a necessity for an army and for civilians. It is necessary, too, for solder and brass and bronze alloys needed to resist corrosion in machines. There are no tin deposits in United States of America; 75 percent of our supply comes from the Far East which has the world's greatest unused reserves, and without which we could not get the tin we need.

For many other products far eastern resources are an immediate need for our industries and indispensable in time of war. Steel cannot be made without manganese; radio, radar, electronics require the highest grade of mica; castor beans make an oil which will resist the low temperatures of Arctic flying and is also necessary for certain types of plastics, paints, and enamels. We depend on India for vital quantities of these products, and India in turn depends on us for machinery, autos and trucks, drugs, chemicals, hardware, and electrical equipment which we send her in return. Bauxite is the raw material for aluminum; chromite is essential for heat-resistant steels and alloys which maintain their strength at high temperatures, and cannot be replaced by any other product; graphite is indispensable for crucibles which will stand the many heatings and coolings necessary in making high-grade steel; hemp is the only known material strong and elastic enough to make high-tension ropes. Natural rubber is essential for heavy-duty tires and many other purposes, and also because we cannot afford to use up our petroleum resources in making artificial rubber. For all of these products we depend on the Far East for indispensable supplies, and these countries depend on us for machinery, iron and steel, chemicals, medicines, tobacco, fertilizers, textiles, canned milk, and other foods. Some of their mineral resources do not exist in adequate quantities anywhere else in the world. For many of the agricultural products, such as rubber and hemp, the Far East is by soil and climate especially adapted to their production. They could be produced elsewhere only after huge expenditure of capital and a period of development requiring many years.

Trade with the Far East is vital to us because we need the best materials and must have a steady supply in the immediate future. If these young nations are to keep their freedom, they need the products we send them in return and our help in developing their own industries and resources. To permit Soviet Russia to close them into her walled-off economic system, would mean poverty and slavery for them, for Russia can neither help them toward freedom and self-government nor toward the use of their resources to raise living standards.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed an item appearing in the Weekly Summary of Developments, issued by the Economic Cooperation Administration, under the heading "China program." I ask to have printed what appears in paragraph (b), which shows the difficulties the Chinese Communists are now running into behind their own lines.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(b) The Communists were reported experiencing serious difficulties in effecting a smooth economic take-over of the large areas being brought so rapidly under their control. Considerable unrest was reported in Canton and other south-coast areas. Meanwhile, in the large cities of north and central China a sharp inflationary spiral in commodity prices was taking place. Rice, cotton cloth, and flour were the leading items in this rise, which soon spread to other commodities and was reflected in rising rates for the parity deposit unit, foreign exchange, and bank interest. Strenuous efforts by the authorities, particularly in Shanghai, to control this rise by dumping through state trading organizations seemed only to slow but not to check, the price rise. Poor food harvests, increased demands for commodities in newly captured areas of south China, and speculative activities of city merchants seemed to be the chief factors in the inflationary trend.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the other papers and documents I have placed in the RECORD, the letter of resignation of Ambassador Hurley, as well as copy of a letter written by me to Secretary of State Dean Acheson under date of January 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful to both you and the Secretary of State for the support you have given me and for your kind offer in requesting me to return to China as Ambassador.

In one capacity or another I have been on the perimeter of America's influence since the beginning of the war. During the war I have served in Java, Australia, New Zealand, and generally in the Southwest Pacific, in Egypt, Palestine, the Lebanon, Syria, Transjordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Russia, Afghanistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, and China. Of all of the assignments China was the most intricate and the most difficult. It is a source of gratification to me that in all my missions I had the support of President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, Secretary Stettinius, yourself, Mr. President, and Secretary Byrnes.

In the higher echelon of our policy-making officials American objectives were nearly always clearly defined. The astonishing feature of our foreign policy is the wide discrepancy between our announced policies and our conduct of international relations. For instance, we began the war with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and democracy as our goal. Our associates in the war at that time gave eloquent lip service to the principles of democracy. We finished the war in the Far East furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism. Inasmuch as I am in agreement with you and the Secretary of State on our foreign policy, I think I owe it to you as well as to the country to point out the reasons for the failure of the American foreign policy in reaching the objectives for which we said we were fighting the war.

I will confine my remarks in this letter to Asia, although I wish to assure you that I will be at your service in discussing frankly other phases of our international relations. I was assigned to China at a time when statesmen were openly predicting the collapse of the National Government of the Republic of China and the disintegration of the Chinese Army. I was directed by President Roosevelt to prevent the collapse of the Government and to keep the Chinese Army in the war.

From both a strategical and diplomatic viewpoint the foregoing constituted our chief objective. The next in importance was the directive to harmonize the relations between the Chinese and American Military Establishments and between the American Embassy in Chungking and the Chinese Government. It will readily appear that the former objective could not be accomplished without the accomplishment of the secondary objective as a condition precedent. Both of these objectives were accomplished. While these objectives had the support of the President and the Secretary of State, it is no secret that the American policy in China did not have the support of all the career men in the State Department. The professional Foreign Service men sided with the Chinese Communist-armed party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself. Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National Government did not represent the policy of the United States. These same professional diplomats advised the Communist-armed party to decline unification of the Chinese Communist Army with the National Army unless the Chinese Communists were given control.

Despite these handicaps we did make progress toward unification of the armed forces of China. We did prevent civil war between the rival factions, at least until after I had left China. We did bring the leaders of the rival parties together for peaceful discussions. Throughout this period the chief opposition to the accomplishment of our mission came from the American career diplomats in the Embassy at Chungking and in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department.

I requested the relief of the career men who were opposing the American policy in the Chinese theater of war. These professional diplomats were returned to Washington and placed in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department as my supervisors. Some of these same career men whom I relieved have been assigned as advisers to the supreme commander in Asia. In such positions most of them have continued to side with the Communist-armed party and at times with the imperialist bloc against American policy. This, Mr. President, is an outline of one of the reasons why American foreign policy announced by the highest authority is rendered ineffective by another section of diplomatic officials.

JANUARY 3, 1950.

HON. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that under date of December 23 or thereabouts, the State Department issued a memorandum to various military attachés and others, indicating that Formosa could not be held for long and to do everything possible to prepare the public for the loss of the island and to stress the fact it was not needed for the strategic defense of the United States.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee, I desire to have a copy of this memorandum at the earliest possible date.

With best personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I first want to commend my distinguished colleague for his splendid presentation of this difficult problem which is facing us. I may say further that I plan to follow the Senator with a presentation next

week of my own observations based on my trip to the Far East.

At this moment, however, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Does the Senator share the view with me, which I got very strongly from my study of the whole question, and especially from my trip and contacts out there, that this Communist-Chinese movement originated in Moscow some 20 years ago with a plan which was then conceived; that Chinese were taken to Moscow and trained for this very leadership; that the leadership today are Moscow-trained agents, directed now from Moscow, supplied by Moscow, and that the plan in China follows the plan under the Moscow program of the new kind of Russian infiltration into various countries of the world?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the able Senator from New Jersey, who is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and who has done such yeoman service in support of our policy in western Europe, and in the Americas, that I believe he is absolutely correct, that the Communist leader Mao Tse-tung and the other leaders are taking their direction from the Kremlin; they are part and parcel of the international Communist conspiracy, and that the bill of goods which had been sold to some people for a period of years that the Communists were only agrarian liberals now stands exposed, particularly in view of the statements of Mao Tse-tung himself in July, and in earlier and later statements, and his more recent meeting with Premier Stalin in Moscow.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Would the Senator then agree with me further that while, as he has pointed out, we have taken yeoman steps in dealing with the western European situation; while we have put through the Atlantic Pact; while we have put through our program there to halt the spread of communism; in other words while we have locked the door against its further spread in Europe; yet we have left the back door wide open in Asia, and if today we should be led into the fatal error of recognizing the Communist regime in China, our far eastern policy would be completely at variance with what has been our policy in western Europe?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct in saying that while we have closed the door to communism in Europe we have not only left the door open in Asia, but by our policies we have accelerated the spread of communism in Asia, so that today gains for communism there have far more than offset the losses suffered by communism in Europe.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Does the Senator agree further that the recognition of Communist China, which is the key to the whole situation, would be the signal for the other nations of Asia that are wobbling on the brink to join in the procession, so that all the nations of Asia may turn to communism at our own back door?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it would put a premium on insurrection and revolution. It would say to those connected with the international conspiracy of communism, "If you can seize power by

force of arms you will get the blessings of Great Britain and any other country that may follow her, and, perhaps, if you just hold out a little while until the heat cools off you may even get the blessing of the United States of America." I say that any such policy of recognizing the Communist regime in China either by ourselves or by those associated with us in the North Atlantic Pact undermines a basic policy we have tried to formulate to protect and to give to the world a place in which free men in a free world may live. We cannot dam up the tide of communism in Europe and let it run over its banks in Asia. Communism is just as destructive of human liberty in Asia as it is in Europe.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree completely with the Senator from California. I thank him for his statement. As I announced a moment ago, I hope next week to continue this debate based upon my experience obtained from my recent trip to Asia.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. May I inquire of the Senator if when he was in the Far East he visited Formosa?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; the Senator did.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator have a personal conference with Chiang Kai-shek?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California not only met Premier Yen, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, but Acting President Li Tsung-jen, who at that time was in a hospital in Hong Kong; the government and provincial officials in Formosa, and the municipal officials in Chungking and Nanning and the members of their Congress, what they call the legislative Yuan in China.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad the Senator saw those parties, but I was inquiring about the Generalissimo particularly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I met him.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator go over with him all the questions he has discussed here today?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did not go over with him all these questions; no.

Mr. CONNALLY. What did the Senator go over with him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California, when he has had private conversations with individuals who hold responsible positions in government, is not in the habit of giving a stenographic report on such conversations any more than is the able Senator from Texas. I am prepared at a later date to document any of the statements that have been made, and I shall do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not quarrel with the Senator's statement now, but in the course of his remarks he referred to having seen all these people.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. And inferences might be drawn from that, whether or not they are true, that the views expressed by the Senator reflected their views.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I think the Senator from California and other Senators on the floor have for some considerable period of time been interested in our foreign policy. I happen to speak as one who has supported the foreign policy in Europe, because I thought we had a policy which made sense and which was understood by Congress and the country. It was to try to maintain human freedom. It was to give economic rehabilitation to the war-torn nations, recognizing that communism thrives on economic and political collapse. We recognized that economic aid alone might not be sufficient. So for the first time in our history we entered the North Atlantic Pact, because we recognized in this day and age of the airplane and the atom that an act of aggression there must be of concern to the law-abiding nations everywhere, and because we have a policy in Europe that has made some sense, I have supported it.

But we have had no such policy in Asia, and to the contrary, the record is very clear that the policies followed by this Government have run counter to the policies we follow in Europe. We have actually urged on the Republic of China to take Communists into their Government. We tried to force them to do it by withholding arms and ammunition from them at the very time the Soviet army of occupation was giving arms and ammunition to the Communist forces there. We issued the white paper when they had their backs to the wall. We have followed a policy in Asia which is destructive of our policy in Europe.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator oppose the mission of General Marshall when he was in China?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California was not a Member of the Senate of the United States all of that time. He happened to have been in the Army, in the European theater of operations.

Mr. CONNALLY. He had some views on the subject, did he not? He did not stay in the Army? He came out of the Army.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I came into the Senate in September 1945.

Mr. CONNALLY. But General Marshall was over there at a later period, was he not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did not favor the views of General Marshall in trying to form a coalition with the Communists.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I wonder if the Senator could shed some light on a certain subject. I read in a local newspaper a short time ago that the man in charge of promotions or placements in one branch of the State Department is named John Service, the same John Service who in 1944, according to Gen. Patrick Hurley's papers, advocated that we torpedo Chiang Kai-shek, and who officially as a representative of the State Department said that the only hope of Asia was communism. The same John Service was later picked up by the FBI on charges of espionage. He was not tried, he was not convicted, but was brought home, promoted, and put in charge of

personnel and placement in the State Department.

As I said, I read this in a local newspaper, the Times-Herald, and I wonder if the Senator could shed any light on that particular situation, as to whether or not the situation still exists, in other words, whether this man, John Service, who in 1944 said, "Let us scuttle Chiang Kai-shek" and who said the only hope of Asia is communism, this man who was picked up by the FBI, for espionage, who was accused of having had a sizable number of secret documents in his possession which he was handing over to the Communists, is still in charge of personnel and placement, as he apparently was about a month ago when the article appeared in the newspaper?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I cannot throw any light on the Senator's statement at this time. I should like to have printed in the RECORD, however, a letter of resignation submitted by Ambassador Hurley at the time, in which he points out that some of the persons he had removed from the China area in the State Department he later found to be issuing instructions from the Far Eastern Division. I do that without any relation to the Senator's statement, but I think the letter of Mr. Hurley will speak for itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish first to compliment the Senator from California for giving this timely report on some of his findings in the Pacific. Having spent some time in some of the same places the Senator from California has visited, I should like to make certain inquiries.

The Senator has indicated that our policy, as announced at the time of sending General Marshall to China, was that China was to take into its Government certain Communists and make a coalition of the Communists and the National Government. I wish to ask the Senator whether he found evidence in the Far East that we had the same policy in relation to Korea, namely that the Koreans, too, were advised that the policy of the United States was that they should and must take Communists into their Government when it was formed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator that I have been advised, on what I believe to be reliable authority, that the American authorities in Korea, at the time when a provisional government was getting ready to be established there, urged that Communists be taken into the Korean Government, and even went to the extent of offering to give the Communists 40 percent of the strength in the Government. However, I understood that the Communists rejected that offer, because they wanted at least 51 percent. I think that is a matter to which the Foreign Relations Committee and other proper committees should give further study in order to get the facts.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask another question. Is the Senator satisfied, from evidence received, that that was our policy?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Based upon information which the Senator from Michigan has, and which I received while I was there, I think it has a substantial foundation in fact.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to ask a few more questions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from California has indicated that he has a memorandum from the United Press as to a memorandum dated December 23, sent to our various embassies and Foreign Service officials in the Far East; and he has offered that press release as a part of the RECORD. He also has indicated that he has asked the State Department for a copy of the original document, so that he and the Senate as a whole might be advised regarding the exact text of that memorandum. Can the Senator advise whether up to this time the State Department has furnished that document to him or has given him evidence on that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In answer to the Senator's question, I say that on January 3, the day the wire services carried the story from Tokyo, I wrote Secretary Acheson the following letter:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that under date of December 23, or thereabouts, the State Department issued a memorandum to various military attachés and others indicating that Formosa could not be held for long, and to do everything possible to prepare the Americans for the loss of the island, and to stress the fact that it was not needed for the strategic defense of the United States. As a member of the Senate Armed Service Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee, I desire to have a copy of this memorandum at the earliest possible date.

With best personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

I will say that in addition to that, I talked with Under Secretary Webb over the telephone. Under Secretary Webb, as I mentioned in my remarks a few minutes ago, said that he believed the document was a classified document for the information of Foreign Service and other official personnel overseas. He did not undertake to say that I could not have the document, but at the same time he did not say that I could have it.

Subsequent to that, I had a call from Mr. Webb, saying that he thought he could arrange for me to see the document, but that it could not be sent. I told him that would not satisfy my request, under the circumstances.

This morning the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I had a conference lasting an hour and a half with the Secretary of State. I do not intend to go into that at this time, obviously. But I think that is indicative of the history of this matter.

I have not yet received a copy of the document. I wish to compliment the American wire services, because I think they have done more to keep the American public informed about foreign policy and other matters upon which they are entitled to information than the policy followed by the State Department—the

policy of lowering an iron curtain between their activities and the Congress and the country—has done. Based upon that document and upon what I believe to be an accurate representation of what was in it—in which it is flat-footedly stated that Formosa has no strategic value—I have raised this question on the floor of the Senate, and I shall raise it again and again: Upon what do they base the statement that Formosa has no strategic value? Have they received any such information from General MacArthur? Have they received any such information from Admiral Radford? Have they received any such information, indeed, from the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

It is my opinion that they have received no such information, and that to that extent it is a misleading document, which has been sent to our State Department representatives overseas.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from California has indicated that he has spoken to certain men in the Pacific, including the general in charge of Japan, General MacArthur; and the Senator has also named Admiral Radford and others with whom the Senator has conferred. Would the Senator be able to state to the Senate whether, so far as his knowledge is concerned, we had, at the time when the Senator spoke to those men, a foreign policy in the Pacific?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator that there is no doubt in my mind that the responsible commanders in the Pacific are greatly concerned lest Formosa fall into unfriendly hands.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, not wishing to quote or not quoting exactly the language of the men who are in charge of our defense of the Pacific, the Senator from California would say to the Senate today that he did not find in the Pacific evidence, as indicated in the document dated December 23, that Formosa is not of any strategic value to the United States of America?

Mr. KNOWLAND. To the contrary, upon my responsibility as a Senator of the United States, it is my judgment that the responsible commanders in that area of the world feel that Formosa is a very strategic island and that its loss into unfriendly hands would be detrimental to the American defense in the Pacific.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is that the reason why the Senator from California has stated that if Formosa is lost, then we might expect that the defense line would move to the Pacific coast, as the Senator has indicated?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It would certainly greatly weaken the American defense position in that part of the world, if Formosa should fall into unfriendly hands.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Long in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to commend the Senator from California for his very well phrased and carefully thought out statement on a subject of the highest importance. Without necessarily agreeing with all the Senator's conten-

tions or his conclusions, I should like to assure him that, as one Member of the Senate and as one member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I feel that his contentions are entitled to categorical answers by the State Department, and I shall do whatever I can to see that those categorical answers are obtained.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, I was very much interested in what the Senator from California had to say, because on many occasions he and I have come to some area of agreement on these matters. But it seems to me that, even agreeing with the conclusions reached by the Senator, we somewhat miss the point in regard to this question of international policy. I wish to ask the Senator a very serious question in regard to the enigma of China. I know a little, personally, about the Orient. Is the Senator from California convinced that this upheaval in China is not literally a civil war?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course it is a civil war, in the sense that there have been Chinese fighting Chinese, with one group of Chinese led by Moscow-trained Communist leaders—

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is no question about that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And the other group under the Nationalist Government of China. To that extent, if that is a definition of civil war, certainly there has been civil war going on there.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then I wish to ask the Senator another question: Is he convinced that if it were possible to leave Russia out of the equation—

Mr. KNOWLAND. But it is not possible to leave Russia out of it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the Senator convinced that this would not have happened in China, regardless of Russia or regardless of the communistic influences the Senator has suggested in his speech?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I would not say that in that country or any other countries there would not have been certain upheavals, as there have been from time to time in certain South American countries and in Mexico and other countries, before stability reached those areas of the world. But I say there is a vast difference between a fight between two local groups, each trying to obtain control, and finally one of those groups triumphs and obtains the possession of power in that country, and the kind of fight we have witnessed in China. A fight between two strictly local or strictly national groups is one thing, but it is quite another thing when communism is on the march and is using, not the tactics of Hitler but the new technique of taking a country from within. The people of Czechoslovakia are just as enslaved under the Communist regime as they were under the Hitlerian regime. Of course, I say that under the Communists there were not to date any overt Soviet invasions across the border; but a man like Petkov, who was hanged, is just as dead as if he had been hanged

by the Nazis. So in that respect there is no difference.

Yet international communism has been able to make its advance, so that now international communism has an aggregate of power just as great, if not considerably greater, than Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini had at the height of their power.

It has been the viewpoint of the Senator from California, who has supported the United Nations and the international effort to preserve the peace of the world, that our best chance of preserving the peace of the world would be to assure the law-abiding nations a sufficient amount of power so that no potential aggressor nation would feel that his calculated risk of winning was greater than his calculated risk of losing. But, once the 13 men of the Kremlin, who are not dependent upon public opinion, feel that their chance of winning is greater than that of losing, that period is, I think, a great danger period for the peace of the world, and certainly the attitude we have taken in Asia of constantly retreating before communism does not serve the cause of world peace anymore than Mr. Chamberlain's position at Munich served the peace of the world, because appeasement, then and now, as I pointed out, and as was so ably demonstrated by the Senator from Michigan, is but surrender on the installment plan. So, I think those facts must be kept in mind, and we must realize that we are dealing with an international conspiracy to destroy the liberty of free people everywhere.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not disagree with the Senator on that at all, but it seems to me again we are missing the real issue here. If the conclusion of the Senator is correct that we have retreated, the decision might have been that we were retreating from the frying pan into the fire, no matter which way we moved in China, affirmatively or negatively. It seems to me even granting all the Senator says to be correct—and I know the facts he states are correct—we may disagree on conclusions, but we have got to talk about the other side when we make a decision. I presume that facts could be gathered—in fact I know they could be—which would be just damning of the nationalistic government as of the Communist government.

I think we face a problem in connection with which we must consider both sides, and what they have done. I recommend to the Senator a book that has just been published called *China Shakes the World*, by a very noted Chinese oriental correspondent by the name of Jack Belden, in which the same damning evidence appears. Of course, we do not want a Communist-dominated government anywhere in the world, but it is a question of making a choice in some instances, when we have to determine a policy.

What bothers me seriously is that in this matter we are between the devil and the deep blue sea. I assume the facts to be as stated in both instances. I do not disagree with the Senator. He and I have agreed on many things. I do not disagree with him in regard to the military importance of the Pacific. I know a little bit about that, too. But the

question of policy in the Far East must necessarily involve a discussion of those who now have control of the great geographical areas of China. I think that is the meat of the coconut.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not quite agree with the Senator that that is the meat of the coconut. I tried to stress in the remarks I previously made—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I interrupt further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know; I am not so positive in my conclusions as is the Senator from California. I wish I knew. Probably Mr. Truman would make me Secretary of State if I knew the answer. But it seems to me that in any discussion, anyone who knew the answer would be valuable to this country in respect to its foreign policy. I do not know, but it seems to me that all our discussions are one-sided on this matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator that certainly the Senator from California recognizes that this is a very complex problem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I know that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Far East has always been a very complex problem. But we also are faced with the fact that communism is overrunning the land mass of Asia. I do not happen to believe that that is in the best interests of the peace of the world or of the security of this Nation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Nor do I.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator and I live on the Pacific coast. We saw a nation of about 75,000,000 people—Japan—which is relatively small compared with the land mass of Asia, drive the United States out of the Philippines, out of Guam, out of Wake; strike us almost a mortal blow at Pearl Harbor; move in through the Aleutians, and take some of our own territory, and actually occupy a position where they could make some minor raids upon the Pacific coast. That same nation of 75,000,000 people chased the British Empire completely out of the Pacific, except for Australia; moved the Dutch out; moved the French out; and drove China, which was then a relatively strong nation and an ally of ours, clear back into the mountains.

Now, what do we have? We already have international communism, that has taken, not 75,000,000 people, but more than 400,000,000 people of China, behind the iron curtain. Most of the responsible government officials of that area of the world, representing the Governments in Korea, the Philippines, and other places, recognize that the problem of holding southeast Asia, Burma, Indochina, and Siam is rendered very much more difficult by letting the Chinese Communists reach the borders of those countries, because there is the opportunity for a Greek situation, multiplied 10 times. In other words, with large Chinese populations in those countries, the opportunity of running arms, of having an incursion of agitators, of stirring up revolt, is greatly increased, and there are some people who believe, and I think with good reason, that if we lose all of China, with her 450,000,000 people, and southeast Asia, with some 100,000,000 more, the problem of ultimately

holding India and Pakistan will be greatly complicated. So certainly at some point along the line we are going to have to adopt a policy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I may say so to the Senator, I do not agree with that at all. I think it is one of the most regrettable things in history that this has happened, but I do say that in any discussion of this matter we must discuss the alternative. The Senator has recommended some alternatives, with which I may or may not agree. But I think that in any discussion of this matter we must consider the alternative.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Obviously.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It happens that in China there is a peg on which we are hanging our hat—an alternative that also must be investigated. That is what is bothering me about the matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course we had that same problem in Greece.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; we did.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We entered the situation when there was a civil war in Greece, and we supported the legal government against the Communists, because we felt the Communist international conspiracy was trying to take away the liberties of the people of Greece. We may not have agreed 100 percent with the Greek Government, as then constituted—

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think we did, at the time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But we felt it was important to the peace of the world and to the security of this Nation not to permit Greece to become communistic.

We took a considerable calculated risk in Berlin. Very recently we were flying our planes over territory controlled by the greatest—and I say it advisedly—the greatest land military power in the world today, the Soviet Union. At any time some of those planes might have been shot down. Had they been, we would have faced a very difficult alternative. But, had we backed down, all Berlin would today be Communist, probably all of western Germany, and perhaps all of western Europe.

So we stood up to communism in Europe, and communism itself has receded. In every nation where a free election has been held the Communist strength has diminished since we undertook to stand up to communism in that area of the world. But in Asia, what did we do? There we cringed before communism. We permitted our Ambassador to be held in his compound. We permitted an American vice consul to be beaten up by the Communist police. We permitted Mr. Angus Ward to be held in confinement for 13 months and thrown into a common jail. A young man from Long Beach, Calif., wearing the uniform of the American Navy, and a sergeant of the United States Marine Corps have been held prisoners of the Communists for 13 months, and we have done nothing about it but send them notes, to slap them on the wrist, and to ask them will they not please let them out. A man wearing the uniform of a general of the United States, General Soule, and his assistant for 4 months had been trying to get out of the country, and every obstacle was thrown in their path. So I

say advisedly we cringed before communism there.

When I was in the Far East last, in January 1946, this Nation stood at the peak of its power and prestige in that area of the world, and it almost brings tears to one's eyes, I say to the Senator from Washington, when he sees the low estate into which we have fallen today by the bankrupt policy we have followed in the Far East.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I do not disagree with the statement of the cases the Senator makes. We are all trying to seek an intelligent answer, and my only point was that in these discussions there should be some mention of the alternative. If we do what the Senator says, perhaps that is the wise thing to do; but in arriving at that policy we must consider the alternative.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There has been no discussion on this floor and, I think, too little in the press of the alternative. That is all I suggest. I do not disagree with the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator not admit, however, that this is a pretty late date for us to send Dr. Jessup on a slow boat to China, and for us to announce that we are waiting until February 1, to send our Joint Chiefs to talk with our Supreme Commander in the Pacific about what should be done in Formosa, when as a matter of fact today, prior to any of the discussions, the President of the United States writes off any further military assistance to the Republic of China, which was our wartime ally and friend. Whom are they trying to kid? What kind of consultations were they going to have? Was it merely to take the heat off in Congress? Was this merely window dressing they were going through, or do they sincerely mean to try to find a new policy? I say, based on the record, which cannot be disputed, including the memorandum of December 23, and the President's statement today at his press conference, they had no intention of helping the Republic of China to resist the Communist invasion there.

The responsibility is solely and exclusively on the shoulders of the administration. The Republican Party has not been consulted; it has not been called into any bipartisan consultation on foreign policy. This debacle solely and exclusively rests upon the administration which initiated and tolerated it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator has said that Dr. Jessup has been sent out there. That is correct. We have sent all sorts of persons to China, while the war was still in progress and even prior to the war. They have all come back with different answers and conclusions. There have been three or four missions which I recall. I do not know the objective of Dr. Jessup's visit. But surely the information we have received has been well examined by those who have gone there long prior to this time. Again I say that there is much confusion, and it may be that the Senator's conclusions are correct; but, nevertheless, the alternative has never been discussed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me call the Senator's attention to a dispatch from the Associated Press which appears in tonight's Washington Star:

Roving United States Ambassador Philip C. Jessup arrived today in Japan, first stop on an Asian survey trip that will take him to Formosa—new focal point of American controversy on far-eastern policy.

The tall, lanky envoy said he will confer with General MacArthur on the matter of the big island. Formosa is the last-stand bastion of Chiang Kai-shek's Chinese Nationalist Government.

It seems to me to be a little futile to have him out there preparing to discuss with our supreme commander the importance of Formosa while, at the same time, the President is announcing that we do not intend to do anything about Formosa.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have had many missions to Formosa.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The President says, in a statement issued today:

Similarly, the United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa.

Does not the Senator feel that that is entirely inconsistent with the position this country took in Greece, under almost the same circumstances?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not only in Greece, but it is also inconsistent with what we are doing in Korea, where we have a very able mission. I met with them myself last month. Under General Roberts, they are training the Korean Army, who have been subject to incursions across that territory.

Mr. TAFT. This statement of the President is absolutely contrary to every other policy pursued by the Government throughout the world today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct—where we have a will to prevent communism from going beyond the iron curtain.

Mr. TAFT. The President continues:

In the view of the United States Government, the resources on Formosa are adequate to enable them to obtain the items which they might consider necessary for the defense of the island.

Does the Senator regard that as an implication in any way that if we consider they are not sufficient, we shall then provide aid, or is it merely an excuse?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I regret to say that, based on the information I have, I think that is window dressing because I think it is clearly indicated that there is no intention of giving any support other than the \$75,000,000 for military aid appropriated by the Congress at the last session.

Mr. TAFT. The last sentence of the President's statement is as follows:

The United States Government proposes to continue under existing legislative authority the present ECA program of economic assistance.

Does the Senator know of any economic assistance now being rendered to Formosa?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; a very limited amount, primarily the joint Chinese rural rehabilitation program. We sent last month, I think, four shiploads of fertilizer. We want to increase production. But fertilizer will not stop communism. That is not, basically, what the people want who are trying to defend their island against the same type of Communist aggression which has occurred in other sections of the world.

Mr. TAFT. The President's statement says:

Nor does it—

The United States—

have any intention of utilizing its armed forces to interfere in the present situation.

Are we not bound by treaty to use our armed forces to interfere with Communist invasion of Denmark or of the islands in the Baltic, or of Norway, or any of the other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would merely say that this is the difference. This is a point which I was discussing with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. In the case of an overt aggression, I think the situation is very clear. I think it is less clear in a locally inspired rebellion, though I am inclined to believe that even there we would have, in the North Atlantic community, some considerable interest in a Communist attempt to attack. But it is not quite so clear a point as would be the marching of Russian troops across a frontier.

Mr. TAFT. The Greek situation is similar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. The rejection of any idea of using our armed forces to stop the advance of communism in the area in question is wholly inconsistent with what we have agreed to do in stopping the advance of communism in Europe.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. The legal Government of China is now being attacked.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from California that we make a mistake when we say the executive department has no policy in China. I think there has been a very definite policy there. I should like to suggest that putting communism into Manchuria resulted from a definite agreement to which we were a party, and this gave communism a perfect springboard to go into the rest of China. I suggest that a second policy was the effort of the administration to persuade the nationalists of China to take Communists into their Government. The result which has occurred is therefore the desired result. The only difference is that the Communists had to fight for what they got, while our executive policy was to give it to them without a fight.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think, based on the cold record, the Senator has substantial grounds for his statement, and I believe they are correct grounds for saying that we have accelerated the spread of communism in China by the policies followed by our Government.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It has been suggested that we have not considered the alternatives sufficiently. I think the choice of alternatives is made very clear by the fact that one of them, the maintenance of the Chinese Nationalist Government did not involve the maintenance of an enemy against the United States, whereas the other alternative comes to that very thing. I suggest that the choice of alternatives is very simple for any citizen of the United States to make.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator from Colorado that when the whole story is revealed to the people of the United States I think they will react very strongly to the policy which their Government has followed, which, while calling upon them to give aid and assistance to stop communism in Europe, has, in fact, been aiding, abetting, and giving support to the spread of communism in Asia.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator has been reading much in the press about America winning the cold war. From what the Senator has just reported, I should like to ask him to state frankly to the American people whether we are winning the cold war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As a Senator of the United States, I may say to the Senator from Indiana, and I say it reluctantly, that after having been in the Far East I am personally convinced that internationally communism has made gains in Asia which many times offset the losses of communism in Europe.

Mr. JENNER. Are not the figures something like this? In January, 1945, at the end of World War II, the Communists dominated 190,000,000 people on the world's surface. Today, less than 4 years from the end of World War II, the Communists dominate 800,000,000 people, almost half of the world's population. Is not that a correct statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not know precisely the population figures. I think they are substantially that ratio. Certainly more than that number of persons are now jeopardized by international communism.

Mr. JENNER. In other words, the Marshall plan to stop the spread of communism in Europe has been merely a holding action while communism ran rampant in the East. After communism consolidates her gains in the East what is to prevent her from coming back and picking up where she left off in the West?

Mr. KNOWLAND. When she has consolidated her position, I think she will do precisely that.

Mr. JENNER. I think the Senator has done the American people a great service in bringing out his report on this very timely subject, though I think he does the American people an injustice when he states it can all be charged to the present administration, because the Senator took the assumption that we, as a party, the Republican Party, were invited to participate in a bipartisan foreign

policy on western Europe, but the Democrats did not extend us the courtesy of inviting us in on a bipartisan foreign policy on the Far East. Therefore I do not blame the present administration for this debacle of the world which we face today. I blame the Republican Party as much if not more than I blame the Democratic Party, because bipartisanship in one part of the world affecting the foreign policy cannot be separated from any other part of the world. If we are to have bipartisanship in the foreign policy, we must be bipartisan all over the world.

My suggestion to the Republicans and to America is to have a rebirth of the two-party system of government, so that when things are going on as they have been going on for 4 years in China, we as a party can stand up and do what we are obligated to do, be a party of opposition, draw the issues, and give the American people a choice.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I speak as one who has supported the American foreign policy in Europe, and I say to the Senator from Indiana that I have proudly supported the American foreign policy in Europe, because I do not believe it was in the interest of the peace of the world or the security of this Nation to have western Europe overrun by Soviet Russia. Had we not had a foreign policy that stood up to communism in Europe—while it is somewhat of an academic question, of course, and we cannot prove it—my personal judgment is that, with the possible exception of Great Britain, all of western Europe would today be under Communist domination. I do not happen to think that would be in the best interest of the peace of the world or the security of this Nation.

I believe that the Republican Party made a substantial contribution to our foreign policy. I believe it did it by correcting mistakes which had been suggested by the administration. I believe it did it by improving legislation, and in many other ways. But my point is that we have had no such policy in the Far East. The administration has followed a contrary policy in that area of the world.

Mr. JENNER. Why have we not had such a policy in the Far East? If we had a bipartisan foreign policy in Europe, why did the Republican leaders, who were exponents of a bipartisan foreign policy in Europe, stand by and not say anything about our having a say, at least, in the Far East?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Indiana—and there is no need of the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from California differing with each other in this—

Mr. JENNER. Not at all, but I want the American people to see this picture. I want the Republicans to know what is going on.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In my opinion the Senator cannot merely with a wave of his hand eliminate the constitutional process in the United States. Basically the President of the United States has control of the foreign policy, under the Constitution.

Mr. JENNER. Wait a moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The President has direction of the day-by-day operation of our foreign policy.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Unfortunately—and I think the Senator from Indiana will agree with me—the Democratic Party has been in control of the Presidency for, lo, these many years, so under the Constitution it has had primary responsibility for the Nation's foreign policy. The only place where the Republican Party can make itself felt, of course, in such matters is the Congress of the United States as the questions come before it. I believe that the Republican Party has made a substantial contribution to saving western Europe from communism and in improving the programs that were offered. But, unfortunately, the President of the United States, who under the Constitution has the primary responsibility for our foreign policy, came forth with no such policy in the Far East. To the contrary, under his day-by-day direction, for which he has the sole responsibility, he either permitted or induced the representatives of our country in the Far East Commission and in the State Department and in the diplomatic forces overseas to follow this contrary policy.

I do not say that the Congress has not some responsibility, because, as the able Senator from Indiana knows, for some considerable period of time I have been trying, along with other Senators on the floor of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, to arouse some interest in the Far East. I have objected to the lowering of an iron curtain between the doings of our diplomatic representatives overseas in China and elsewhere, and the American Congress and the American people, who I believe are entitled to information. I am sure the able Senator knows that in numerous instances it has been most difficult for the Congress of the United States to get the information we wanted. Take the Wedemeyer report as an example. Had we had the Wedemeyer report when General Wedemeyer issued it, it would have given us a basis on which to go to work on some of these problems.

Mr. JENNER. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt. I understand that General MacArthur makes a biweekly report to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He certainly knows what has been going on in the Far East, being the supreme commander in that area. Yet, I understand that the Committee on Foreign Relations of this body has never had access to those reports. I say it is deplorable that under the bipartisan system we should accuse the President of the United States for what has been going on, when the Republicans—though I have not—have closed their eyes and have said, "We will cooperate in a bipartisan foreign policy in western Europe, but if you do not want to tell us what is going on in the Far East, it is all right, and when you get ready to take us in on your program, we will come in to 'bipartisan' some more with you."

I repeat the prediction, which I first made on this floor a year ago when we were debating the North Atlantic Pact,

that that is only the first pact. As the result of the very information the Senator from California has brought before us today, I say there is going to be another international grab bag in the Pacific. They all have their hands out. Senators know what this administration did recently in Indonesia, before that country became an independent government. They shoveled in several million dollars of ECA aid so that they could do it legally. As one travels around the world, as I have recently done, we find that those who have gotten millions and billions of dollars are wanting millions and billions more. Those who are not getting any say, "You gave it to others, you had better give it to us or we are going communist, too."

We are making an international grab bag out of this country. Stalin is winning the cold war. He does not have to fire a shot or spend a ruble. All he has to do is to keep doing what he has been doing, and he will bankrupt us.

So far as Europe is concerned, the most the Marshall plan has done has been holding the line. Why? Most of those in Europe seem to be either socialist or communist; there is only a degree of color between them, and so far as I am personally concerned, I am color blind. One out of every four Frenchmen is a Communist, and the others of them are either Fascist or Socialist. We will not speak to Franco, yet we are playing "footy" with Tito, who is a Communist. We sent him \$20,000,000 from the Export-Import Bank, and he has his snoopers in Washington trying to get more, and he will get it.

I talked to Bevin. I said, "Are you not concerned with your situation in Hong Kong, with the spread of communism in China and their success there?" He smiled—and there are other Senators on this floor who will verify this statement—and said, "Don't you worry about Hong Kong." He already had his deal made.

Mr. President, the Senator from California has made a magnificent contribution today toward awakening the American people to what is going on. We now have to follow through by returning the two-party system of government to America before we strangle ourselves in continuing bipartisan support of foreign isms.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Michigan, I merely wish to say that I happen to differ to some considerable degree on the point raised by the Senator from Indiana, for whom I hold a high personal regard. I do not believe that this Nation can return to isolationism any more than an adult can return to childhood, no matter how pleasant our childhood recollections may be.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will permit me to finish; I did not interrupt the able Senator. In my responsibilities, in addition to being a member of the Committee on Armed Services and of the Committee on Appropriations, I have served since its inception on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Perhaps that association has made me realize that we do live in the age of the airplane and the atom.

As the able Senator from Indiana has done, I have flown the Pacific and the Atlantic on numerous occasions. This world is a much different world from what it was when General Washington was President and made his Farewell Address to the country. The distance over the polar ice cap is much shorter than the distances covered over former routes of travel. While I hope it will never happen, I personally believe that in the event some overt aggressor nation decides to move in the future, never again will the United States of America have 3 or 4 years to prepare itself. I think the United States of America will be the first target of any potential aggressor, because the Germany of the Kaiser and the Germany of Hitler both saw how the industrial potential and the manpower resources of this Nation turned the tide and snatched victory out of their hands.

Mr. President, no man can look into a crystal ball and discover what the future may bring forth; no man can be certain or dogmatic respecting these things; but, based on the information at my disposal, I believe that the first notice of an outbreak of another war will be when the major industrial and communication centers of America have been subjected to an atomic bomb attack to paralyze this Nation. The attack will not necessarily be on our coastal cities of Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, or Seattle, or Boston, or New York. The interior cities are really on the coast lines of America, because the polar ice cap is the shortest distance across. So every American must form his judgment based on the facts as they exist today in this age of the airplane and the atom bomb.

The reason the Senator from California has supported the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]—and I say I have proudly supported the Senator from Michigan in trying to make a Republican contribution to world affairs—is because I think it is urgent that we maintain a free world of free men; that we try to develop a community of nations so that the law-abiding countries will always have a greater aggregation of power than the potential aggressor nations and the dictatorship states, whether they be Nazi or Communist.

I say again that I do not believe it is in the interest of the peace of the world, I do not believe it is in the interest of the security of my own country to permit 240,000,000 Europeans to go behind the iron curtain, with the great industrial complex which exists in that part of the world.

I admit that men may honestly differ with that point of view. Each of us as a Senator of the United States must search his conscience to determine how he will vote on those questions. But based on the information at my disposal I pursued the course I did. I am just as critical, however, of what I believe has been a misguided policy in Asia, because I say, regretfully, that I think it has undone in Asia most of what has been accomplished in Europe.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to comment on what the able Senator from California said respecting western Europe. I think the Senator has stated the case most clearly as to what we achieved and accomplished in western Europe. I am indeed happy to say that I fully concur with him. The mistakes we made in Asia were mistakes made only in Asia. I do not believe we have made the same kind of mistakes in western Europe. A sad state of affairs would now exist had we not stepped into western Europe and done what we did there. What we have achieved there has given us a great amount of security insofar as the aggressiveness of the ideology of communism is concerned. We can more fully understand what that security means to us when we consider what the Communists could have achieved and accomplished had they gained possession of the industrial section of the entire western Europe.

Mr. President, I am very happy to say that I fully concur with what the Senator from California has said respecting western Europe. If we made a mistake in Asia, that, in my opinion, is something entirely separate from western Europe.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. I agree with what the Senator from California has said. There is no need to talk about isolation. Isolation is about as extinct as the Pharaohs of Egypt.

The Senator from California said, and I agree with him, that when the next conflict comes, if it shall come, our vital centers will be the targets for the first attack. But the world being in the condition the Senator from California has described, with communism having made its greatest gains during the past 4 years, during peacetime years, what are we doing about our own defense? This year, in order to proceed with our grandiose international schemes we are cutting down, by an estimated \$2,000,000,000, the amount to be spent for the defense of our own country. At the same time we are increasing the defenses of nations thousands of miles away by probably another \$1,000,000,000. Then if we are to assume an additional load in the Pacific and place it on the American taxpayers we are going to play right into the hands of Joe Stalin. Communism will take over in our very home country when we become economically and militarily weak.

I agree with the Senator from California that we must keep our Nation strong in order to be able to befriend peoples all around the world.

I do not know what the answer to the Chinese situation is now. I agree with the Senator from California that there has been a betrayal of the Chinese people, our traditional allies. But I do know that one-sixteenth of the world's population, representing the United States of America, cannot continue to do for themselves, do for the Marshall plan countries, do for the Middle East, the Near

East, and the Far East, what all those nations are expecting and are going to continue to expect—and I address myself particularly to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] who just spoke—and still remain solvent both economically and militarily at home.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from California that in my opinion it is very helpful to have this debate on the floor of the Senate because, I think, it will enable the American people to learn, through the discussion here, what some of these problems are. It is going to be very helpful, too, to some of us on the floor of the Senate who need a good deal of information about Formosa and the rest of Asia. It is in that spirit that I rise to ask the Senator from California a few questions in regard to Formosa.

First, I am not certain that I have clearly in mind the legal status of Formosa at the present time. I would appreciate it very much if the Senator from California would briefly explain to me what the legal status of Formosa is in international law today, and what rights, if any, we have in Formosa.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have a specific statement giving the actual quotation from the various agreements that will be helpful, and if I cannot find it in the brief case I have here I will have it added to the RECORD. That will give the precise language.

My understanding of the situation is that at the Cairo Conference, attended by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek, it was agreed that following the defeat of Japan, Formosa, which historically had been a part of China up to the time it was taken away from China in the Sino-Japanese War, would be returned to China. I think that is the first time we determined precisely what should be done respecting Formosa, though there may have been preliminary discussions.

Then later in the Potsdam declaration there is a paragraph which also states that Japan will be stripped of her war-gained conquests, and they will be returned to the people from whom she received them.

I have the memorandum, and I shall read it.

By the Treaty of Shimonoseki, signed April 17, 1895, by Japanese Count Ito and Li Hung-chang, Chinese Ambassador Extraordinary, China recognized the full independence of Korea and ceded to Japan the Pescadores, Formosa, and the Liaotung Peninsula, paid an indemnity to Japan, and negotiated a new commercial treaty.

Recognition took place, in effect, by the United States in the Root-Takahira agreement of November 30, 1908, and the Lansing-Ishii agreement of November 2, 1917. Both agreements proposed to maintain the status quo, and by acquiescence, therefore, recognized Japan's position in Formosa.

Published documents of World War II do not mention Formosa until the Cairo declaration.

The Cairo declaration of December 1, 1943, had this to say:

Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the First World War in 1914, and * * * all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China.

There are a couple of items I left out, which I am sure do not change the intent or purpose of the language.

Second, Formosa was not mentioned in the official protocol of Tehran or Yalta.

Third, The Potsdam ultimatum of July 26, 1945, had this to say:

The terms of the Cairo declaration shall be carried out and Japanese sovereignty shall be limited to the islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, Shikoku, and such minor islands as we determine.

That is the Potsdam powers speaking.

Fourth, Statement of White House on occupation policy in Japan, September 21, 1945, which I also understand was in a directive to General MacArthur, and also, I think, by him issued in a directive as commander in chief in the far Pacific, stated:

Japan's sovereignty will be limited to the islands—

And it gives the same islands I have just mentioned—

and such minor outlying islands as may be determined, in accordance with the Cairo declaration and other agreements to which the United States is or may be a party.

So far as I know, those are the only mentions made of Formosa.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may add this statement, in replying to the Senator from Oregon: Pursuant to those declarations, the Republic of China, with our consent, became the occupying power in Formosa, pending the ultimate treaty. As I understand, from a legal point of view, the Republic of China organized Formosa, which previously had been the Japanese province of Taiwan, but then became a part of the Republic of China, with a legislature.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator because I think his discussion gives us a clear picture of the problem of Formosa.

My second question is this: Does the Senator have an opinion about what is the attitude of the Formosans in regard to the three parties which it seems to me are involved in this controversy, namely, first, the Nationalist Chinese; second, the Communist Chinese; and, third, the Americans? What is the attitude of the Formosans about these groups occupying their island? Is it a case in which they would prefer to have all three stay out, and let them go ahead on some basis of self-determination of their own destiny? Or do they want the Nationalist Chinese in control? Or the Communists in control? Or the Americans in control? Or all three groups out of Formosa?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I say to the Senator, on the basis of having been there, that that is a question on which many persons honestly differ. While I was

there, I made an effort to talk, not only to the Chinese who were there but also to the members of the provisional legislature, who are Taiwanese, as they call themselves, rather than Formosans, and to educators, newspapermen, and to students. In those cases I tried to go to the universities and schools where they were, in order to have as wide a contact as possible. I think this is historically true: Following the defeat of Japan and the occupation of Formosa by the Chinese, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks, the first governor who was sent there was not a competent official; at least, the economy of the country did not improve. Of course, one of the difficulties in both Formosa and Korea was that during the period of Japanese occupation of both those countries, the Japanese did not permit any Korean or any Formosan to hold a position of responsibility, either in government or in business. I am told that the Japanese did not even allow the Koreans to be railroad engineers, although they would allow some of the Koreans to shovel coal, as firemen on the trains. As a result, when the Japanese departed from both Formosa and Korea, they took out of those countries all of the managerial echelon, from both government and business.

At any rate, the first governor did not get the economy back into good condition; and there was dissatisfaction, and insurrection took place, and there was some bloodshed. The Government of China removed the then governor; and since that time, as most of the Formosans with whom I talked told me, I believe they have made an effort to remedy the difficult and bad situations which previously had existed. The more recent governor, who was governor when I was there—and who since has been succeeded by K. C. Wu, a civilian, so that today they have gotten back to a civilian governor—was Gen. Chen Cheng. He made, I believe, a strenuous effort to improve conditions. They had a land reform—one which unfortunately had not taken place on the continent of Asia. Had it occurred on the continent of Asia early enough, it might have remedied the situation there. But that was not done. The then governor of Formosa did that. As a result, food production has greatly increased, because the farmer can now keep a much greater proportion of his crop. As a matter of fact, Formosa now has a surplus of agricultural products. Our ECA officials have told me that on the island there has been an improvement both agriculturally and from an industrial point of view.

I think it fair to say that the overwhelming number of the people of Formosa do not look with favor upon the Communists. I think it might also be fair to say that, as the Senator from Oregon and I might find in our respective States of Oregon and California—and it would apply to many other States of the Union—with the influx of additional people, there has been some overcrowding, some lack of housing, and some competition for jobs. To that extent, perhaps, I think some Taiwanese might look back to the good old days when they were not so overcrowded. But to

me, that is not bordering on insurrection.

However, as I stated to the Senate earlier—and I think the Senator from Oregon heard me say it—I made an effort to get around, both at night and during the daytime; and there was no indication of the police-state methods such as I saw in Poland before Mikolajczyk had to flee for his life, when there were police armed with carbines, and in armored cars, going around.

So I believe there was not such a state of insurrection, and that information to that effect has been misleading.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from California believe that the reports to the effect that the majority of the Formosans are just as much opposed to the Nationalist Chinese as they are to the Communist Chinese are correct? Is that an accurate statement?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not think that is an accurate statement. I think they want, and are entitled to, a larger voice in their own affairs. Having been a member of the California Legislature some 14 or 16 years ago, I made a point to visit the provisional legislature leaders there, and I talked with them. They were critical, in many cases, of some of the policies which had been followed in the past by the Government of China; but I found no indication that they want to be freed by the Communists. To the contrary, what they wanted was for the National Government to give them as much local autonomy as possible and to give them as great a voice as possible in the handling of their affairs, and to cooperate with them in the day-to-day control of the activities on the island.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from California has been very courteous to me in permitting me to ask questions. I should like to ask this further question: Does the Senator believe the Formosans would welcome American intervention in Formosa, backing up the Chinese National Government?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad the Senator has asked that question. I would say that I have not felt that the proper procedure for our Government is to intervene in the sense of sending troops to the island. There are the islands of Formosa and of Hainan, but taking Formosa alone for the moment, which is the last bastion of the Republic of China, which is fighting with its back to the wall—to be perfectly frank, as all of us know—against the Communist wave which has swept over the mainland. For us to go in ourselves without invitation to the island and establish some kind of temporary control, to my mind, would be precisely what the Soviet Union did to Poland when the Poles were fighting with their backs to the wall against Germany; and then, as all of us remember, the Russians moved in from the rear and completely eliminated the government and the freedom of Poland. I do not believe that is a course which we should pursue. I do not believe that the people of Formosa or the remaining people of free China would want that.

The second thing I think we should keep in mind is that we do not need Formosa either as an air base or as a naval

base, because we have others in that area of the world.

But the thing which is vitally important to us is that Formosa not get into unfriendly hands. As for the people of Taiwan, I never saw a more friendly people than the people of that island, both the Chinese and the native Taiwanese. They are friendly to this country. We know they are our friends. So long as they control the island, there is no danger that a potential aggressor enemy will get bases there. So the primary thing, in my opinion, and, I think, in the opinion of many of our responsible persons in that part of the world, is to prevent Formosa from getting into unfriendly hands.

Question may arise, Is the Communist regime in China friendly to the United States? People may honestly differ on that point. Personally, I think that they have displayed their attitude on sufficient occasions so that, so far as I am concerned, I do not want to take the calculated risk of having in Formosa Chinese Communists who may be unfriendly to us. So I can answer the question best by saying that, in my opinion—and let me say at this point that there is a high morale among the troops on that island, and they have some good leadership—what they primarily want is some type of supervised assistance, not by combat troops, but the same supervised assistance that we have given in Greece and Korea.

Mr. MORSE. One more question, please: Assuming that our policy would not be one of intervention by way of sending our own troops over there, but would be one of assistance to the National Chinese Government by way of providing American military advisers and war matériel, might not that type of intervention lead to war? Assuming my hypothesis, in an armed struggle between the Communists and the Nationalist Chinese in Formosa, does the Senator from California feel that even that type of a contest, backed up with American war matériel and military advisers, has in it any inherent danger of an open conflict between the Chinese Communists and the United States with Russia eventually backing the Chinese Communists?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is one of the questions which we must face. I may say to the Senator that I think the risk of a conflict is far less than the risk involved in doing nothing and waiting until we are pushed from place to place, out into the Pacific. That is No. 1.

Secondly, I think that the risk is much less than it was in Greece or at the time of the Berlin airlift. Certainly I think the Senator from Oregon will agree with me that we ran risks in both those instances.

Mr. MORSE. We ran risks with the Russians in countries the populations of which were not Russian. But in Formosa we are running a risk, it seems to me, with a population which is oriental, at least, if not entirely out-and-out Chinese. If I am right in my assumption—I am not sure that I am—that the Chinese Communists intend to take Formosa if they possibly can take it, are we then not running a serious danger, if our intervention takes even the form of mili-

tary advisers or the supplying of war matériel, of an open conflict with the Chinese Communists over Formosa, a conflict which might be interpreted as an act of war on our part?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I say to the Senator from Oregon that I do not believe so, although certainly no prudent man would say that was not a possibility to be reckoned with. I say "no" for two reasons, at the moment: One, up to now—we do not know what the British and some of the other Atlantic Pact nations may do in the next few days—but up to now the overwhelming number of the nations of the world—and I say reluctantly that I think that will change very shortly—are recognizing the present Republic of China. There are very few nations outside the Soviet Union and her satellites who have recognized the Communist regime in China, so that what arms and assistance we are giving would be given at the request of the legal, constitutional government of the country which was our wartime ally and friend, and which is, as of today, a member of the Security Council of the United Nations. I think we would be on perfectly sound legal grounds to comply with their request, just as we have a mission in Korea at the request of the constitutional Korean government, in the southern part of the country south of the thirty-eighth parallel.

I should like to mention a second thing in order to amplify the answer. Some people have said to me, "Is it not true that the equipment which has been sent there has been easily lost to those fighting on the other side?" In the first place, I can say—and I have the figures to support it—that of the \$125,000,000 arms program supported by the Eightieth Congress for aid to China, very little of that equipment, perhaps not more than 10 percent—and that would be a high figure—fell into the hands of the Communists. Secondly, I personally flew from Formosa Island to Kingmen Island, where there had been, on October 25, 26, and 27, a major battle between the Navy and amphibious Communist forces and the Chinese Government forces. The Kingmen battle is very important for Senators to know about, because Kingmen probably would be taken first—it would have to be taken first—before a successful assault upon Formosa, though that would not necessarily follow, but it would certainly be desirable from the Communist point of view. Under the covering of an artillery barrage from a neighboring island which they control—and Kingmen is only a mile from the mainland of China, whereas Formosa is 100 miles from the mainland of China—they landed 10,000 Communist troops. The defending forces were those that had been trained by Sun Leh Jen in this training center to which I have already referred. Despite the fact that the Communists infiltrated their lines, and on the morning of the 26th of October were firing on the Government's strong points from both front and rear, the Government forces held their positions. They so delayed the Communists that the Government was able to land another division from Formosa, and move it into position. They moved some

tanks which they had had on Formosa to Kingmen. They outflanked the Communists. They inflicted 3,000 casualties upon them and captured over 6,000 Communists, with all their arms and equipment. We hear about the Government losing equipment; we seldom hear about the Communists losing it.

Mr. MORSE. That was about October 12; was it not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It was October 25 to 27. They had enough captured equipment left over—I saw much of it myself; it was a hodgepodge of stuff, some American, some Russian, some Japanese—but they had enough left over to send back to Formosa, to equip two more Chinese divisions. The men of Kingmen fought very hard. When I got there, of course, they had been stimulated by the victory. I stopped at 10 or 15 different units across the island. As I went by jeep from one end of the island to the other, the morale was very good. They have a very able commander, General Hu Lien, who was an excellent field soldier, and as a result, that victory, plus the victory on the Chosen Islands, plus seeing personally the high morale of the men that are being trained by Sun Li Jen, leads me to believe that with some moral support, plus some of the equipment they need, they can withstand an amphibious assault over 100 miles of open water.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from California I think he has been exceedingly fair and frank in his colloquy, and in his last remarks he raises the final question I want to ask him. I think we might just as well recognize that in the near future several nations will recognize the government of the Communists in China. That is my opinion for whatever it is worth, and it certainly needs to be supplemented a great deal by much information that I intend to try to get into my head in the days immediately ahead. Of great concern to me is that a struggle over Formosa, if I am correct in the assumption that the Chinese Communists intend to take it, if they can take it—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Oh, I think that is a fair assumption the Senator is making, that they will try to take it.

Mr. MORSE. Granting that assumption, I fear that our intervention in Formosa might endanger a third world war. If we find ourselves engaged in any form of intervention in Formosa, even by supplying military advisers and war matériel, may we be misjudged by other nations? If, as the Senator from California says, he fears the Chinese Communists will try to take Formosa—and I fear it too—with India, which has already recognized the Communist government; with Great Britain, in my opinion, soon to recognize her; with other countries to follow suit, are we not likely to find ourselves in the months immediately ahead in a position where we will be supporting, through military advisers and war materials, a dying National Chinese Government? Will we not be supporting a government that is not recognized by a great many of the other powers of the world to our own international embarrassment? Will we not soon find ourselves out of caste so to speak in the

fraternity of the nations by supporting a government that no longer represents the Chinese people? Will that not likely lead to war?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator from Oregon that the observations he has made are certainly pertinent to the discussion of our foreign policy. It is the view, however, of the Senator from California that sooner or later some decisions must be made by this Nation in the Far East. I admit that any position that may be taken entails some risk, but I repeat, while it is not necessarily a parallel case, I certainly think we took some substantial risks at Berlin; I think we took some substantial risks in Greece; I think we have taken some substantial risks in the North Atlantic Pact and in the arms-implementation program, and if somebody wanted to make something of it, I think they could find the *modus vivendi* for stirring up trouble, if they were determined to do it. But I think we have to look over the long period of history. Here we are, a relatively small nation, 140,000,000 people, and I think it is fair to say, as was pointed out in the colloquy with the Senator from Indiana, that if there is in the future another conflict or a potential aggressor nation gets on the loose, we will be target No. 1. Therefore I think we have to take a look across the years and determine whether the very defenses of this country will be improved or made weaker by all of Asia going behind the iron curtain.

An argument can be made that we should not make the stand at Formosa, even though there is a movement of communism into the Pacific Ocean, but perhaps we should make it some place else. To me it would be far more difficult to make it at Hong Kong than it would be at Formosa, because I think that is a fairly easy city to be taken from within, not necessarily by aggression from without. I think it would be far more difficult to draw the line in French Indo-China, or in Burma, because there is a land border with a stream that one can wade across, so the same argument could be made there with far greater force.

The next question is, Supposing not only all of China but Burma and Indo-China and Siam are lost to communism—and all of that is possible now, in view of what has happened, and we must face realities—then we have communism up against the borders of India. I did not go to India on my recent trip, but I went there in 1946. India has many internal problems of her own. She has a very able leader in Mr. Nehru, a man for whom I have the highest respect and regard. I have been informed that in the past on one or two occasions attempts have been made to assassinate him. The third attempt or the fourth might succeed. If Nehru's leadership were removed, with the internal problems of India, there is some doubt whether India and Pakistan might ultimately remain outside the Communist orbit. Are we to draw the line there, or should we draw it when the Communists move out into the Pacific, into the Philippines, or into the Dutch Indies, now Indonesia? Somewhere along the line we are going to have to make some decisions, and I do

not think by postponing the decisions, hoping the evil day will never come, as, of course, all of us do, we are solving any problems, nor are we doing so by brushing the question under the carpet and failing to face the realities. The Senator comes from a Pacific coast State, as I come from a Pacific coast State, and, as I pointed out before, when it is considered what Japan, a nation of some 75,000,000 people, was able to do in driving us clear back on our Pacific coast defenses, I do not think the Senator from Oregon would contemplate with much pleasure 1,000,000,000 people of Asia tied into the Soviet orbit, when the men in the Kremlin have time after time said that in their judgment the free world and their world cannot exist side by side.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from California that it is because I contemplate with great fear the spread of communism, that I am so disturbed about this development in Asia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. One further point I may make at this time, after which I shall not interrupt the Senator again. As of today, January 5, 1950, we know there has been a change in the world situation with respect to atomic energy. No one knows how far the Russian development has taken them, but that they have made progress has been announced by the President of the United States himself. Let us assume the best side of the picture, and say that the announcement of the President related to a Russian equivalent of the Alamogordo test explosion. At any rate the Russians know the secret. They have the wherewithal, but they have not stock-piled. Time runs in their favor in the matter of stock piling atomic weapons from now on. A year from now they will be much stronger than they are today. Two years from now they will be much stronger than they will be 1 year from now, and so on. Are we going to be less able, a year or 2 years from now, of drawing a line than we are today? I do not know the answer to that question. I do not think the Senator from Oregon knows it, but I think the American people are entitled to have a full discussion of the implications of what is taking place in the world, because I do not believe we can have a sound foreign policy unless not only the American Congress but the American people are adequately informed. After all, the responsibility is ultimately theirs. We are not doing our job adequately if we do not contribute, to the best of our ability, to inform the American public at a time when, I reluctantly say, I do not think the State Department and the administration have been as frank as they should be on a question of this kind.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make this very brief comment. I am so greatly concerned about the spread of communism in Asia, and, may I say, incidentally, about the weakness of our west coast defenses, that, as a Senator from a west coast State I intend to make this particular problem in the months immediately ahead my major concern in the Senate. But I would point out to the Senator from California, that today, at least, if I have correct information, the Chinese civil war has been lim-

ited to Chinese territory. The Senator from California says, "Where are we going to draw the line?" Formosa is still Chinese territory. A civil war is going on in China, the implications of which I do not like, but I think there is a serious question, particularly in view of the prospects of other free governments recognizing the Communist government of China, of getting ourselves into a position of seeking to intervene in protecting a segment of Chinese soil in favor of one party to a civil war against another party. Because of the effect that would have on us in the eyes of other free governments, and particularly the other peoples of Asia, I am very fearful of what their attitude will be in regard to that type of American intervention.

In the Greek situation we moved in on the invitation of the Greek people themselves, to protect them against what was considered to be a threatened invasion by Russia. In the Berlin situation we were seeking to protect such American and German rights as we believed—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If I may interrupt at that point, I should like to say that we were not protecting Greece against a threatened invasion by Russia. On the contrary, there was going on in Greece a civil war of the same kind and character as that which has been going on in China. There was an armed insurrection against the legal government, which had a long history. As a matter of fact, right after the wartime period it will be remembered that in Athens there had been a Communist coup d'état, which almost succeeded in capturing the city of Athens, and all of Greece. It was at that moment that Mr. Winston Churchill, then Prime Minister of Great Britain, gave the order to the British troops to help to support the legal government of Greece against a Communist attack. Had it not been for the intervention of the British troops at that time, it is undeniable, I think, that Athens would have fallen to communism, followed, undoubtedly, by their taking Greece. This country got into it when the British announced that they could no longer support the occupation and had to withdraw. That was approximately the time of the establishment of the Greek-Turkish aid program. We sent supplies to Greece and we later sent a mission there. It was a matter of an attack on the country from within rather than an overt aggression across the borders.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is perfectly correct. However, I think there was great fear in this country—there was great fear, I know, in the Senate, as the debates at that time will show—that there would be a Russian movement into Greece if the Russian support of the Greek Communists was permitted to gain headway. Likewise we feared, I think, back in 1946 and the beginning of 1947, a similar possibility developing in Italy.

But the point I wanted to make in concluding the colloquy I have had with the Senator—and he has been exceedingly kind to me in giving me this time—was that when we deal with the Greece

incident and the Berlin incident we are dealing with a situation in which governments generally throughout the world recognized the then-existing government of Greece and recognized the supposed American and German rights created by the Potsdam agreement so far as Berlin was concerned.

I am one who is critical of our policy in China. I do not think we moved in at the proper time with sufficient help administered under proper conditions when there was a strong Chinese national Government. The Nationalist Chinese Government is now almost non-existent. China is torn by a Chinese civil war. Let that war extend beyond Chinese territory—on this point the junior Senator from Oregon is certain as to his position—let it extend beyond Chinese territory, let the Chinese Communists seek to invade another country, then the Senator from Oregon will take the position that "the chips are down," and we should make it perfectly clear to the Communist Chinese Government that we are not going to let any other country, not a part of China, be invaded by a Chinese Communist Government. That would be my position, whether it were the Chinese Nationalist Government or the Chinese Communist Government.

I am trying to raise problems this afternoon which show, at least, my perplexity and my great fear that we are dealing with a situation which is so hot that the course of action which America takes in respect to it may determine the difference between peace and war, not in Asia alone, but in the world. I add to that conviction a statement which the Senator from California has heard me express in the Armed Services Committee, that I happen to be one who believes America cannot win a third world war. We have won our last world war. We will win great military victories, but if we do not win this peace, then I think America is due for a great decline, because the winning of a military victory in a third world war would of itself, in my judgment, with the difficult problems that would arise, prostrate America economically for decades to come.

So, as one Member of this body, I want to join with the Senator from California in his sincere desire, although we may differ on the procedures, to accomplish the objective of maintaining the peace. I want to do all I can to save our country and our people from a third world war. I think we must win the peace, for the costs of war would be too great, materially as well as spiritually. We cannot afford another war not only from an economic standpoint but from the standpoint of protecting liberty and freedom for all. If forced to fight we will fight to preserve freedom from Russian aggression, but I think we can win the peace if we keep our defenses strong and continue to urge the following of peaceful procedures of international law for the settlement of individual disputes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say in reply to the Senator that, of course, we are all deeply interested in preserving the peace and establishing a system of international law and order, so that the peace of the world will

be secure for ourselves and for our children. Unfortunately, there are sometimes lawless elements loose in communities and a police force is needed. I sometimes question very much the policy of permitting lawless elements to move in and take over a community on the theory that because it is happening in the business district it does not affect a person who lives in the residential district. I think lawlessness in a community concerns all the people. I think lawlessness anywhere in the world must be the concern of the entire world. I know the Senator from Oregon is as sincere as he always is in connection with this problem. But I do ask that when he gives consideration to this problem he also contemplate that the Chinese Communists may not proceed to move a Chinese Communist army across the borders of Burma and Indochina, but rather they will do as the Bulgarians and the Yugoslavs did before the break took place between Tito and Stalin, and move guerrillas into those countries and armies into those bordering countries, and perhaps in the not too distant future we will be discussing an international Communist-inspired revolt in Burma, Indochina, and in time ultimately in India and in Pakistan. When that happens, and if that happens, and if it is successful, as it is today in China, I submit to the able Senator from Oregon that the loss of Asia will be just as complete as if the Chinese Communists or the Soviet Union had actually moved their troops across those borders.

It is a new technique which I respectfully say I do not think the law-abiding nations, the free people of the world, have yet found a way to meet. If they move troops in an aggressive war, everybody can understand it, but the men of the Kremlin are pretty wise; they are cold; they are ruthless. They know that would immediately disturb Senators such as the able Senator from Oregon, and other people throughout the world. It is merely my personal judgment that they will move in the way I have suggested. They will attempt to take each of these countries as they have almost succeeded in taking all of China, certainly all the mainland of China. I hope that in his discussions and in his questions the Senator will also try to help devise some way by which the world can meet this new threat of Communist aggression.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me first commend the Senator for the clarity and the sincerity of his statement, to which I have listened with a great deal of interest.

I desire to understand the Senator correctly with respect to Formosa, which is the important immediate problem. The Senator from Washington stated that there was always an alternative, and that we must consider the alternative. As I understand the Senator from California, he makes himself very clear that, so far as Formosa is concerned, there really is no alternative, in this respect, that the foreign policy of the United

States must be based on what is best for the security of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And the peace of the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And that with respect to Formosa there are two reasons why Formosa should not fall into the hands of the Communists: First, from a military point of view, Formosa is necessary to make Japan, the Philippines, and Okinawa worth while; and, secondly, from the point of view of the spread of communism, there is a danger to the United States, as well as from the military point of view.

Is it a fair summation of the Senator's statements and of his answers in colloquies to say that, so far as he is concerned, Formosa should not be allowed to fall into the hands of the Communists, for the two reasons to which I have just referred?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The two reasons would be included, but the Senator from California would add one more, and it is in line with my discussion with the Senator from Oregon on the question of the new technique and what international communism is doing.

It seems to me that if we give recognition to the Chinese Communist regime, as apparently Britain is going to do in the next few days, we put our stamp of approval upon a police state, which is just as much a police state in China as it is in any of the satellite countries of eastern Europe.

It so happens that the people who have been overrun in China are not all cheering for communism. They have been overrun by force of arms. I have personally talked to people who stayed in Nanking, Shanghai, and Peking, thinking that conditions could not be much worse economically than they had been under the National Government, with inflation, and so forth, who, after having lived under communism for 6 months or a year, as the case may be, have been desperately striving to get out from behind the Chinese Communist iron curtain. They report that there is more discontent behind the lines, that inflation in Communist China, as was indicated in the ECA report which I put into the Record today, is very great, that unemployment is very great, that there is great dissatisfaction among the farmers, whose crops are being taken away from them by the Communist armies, who are living off the land.

So long as the nations of the world recognize the legal government of China, which has its headquarters in Formosa, the people of China who have been overrun still have a hope left as we go through the psychological warfare, that ultimately they will be free and will not be abandoned behind the iron curtain. But once we give our stamp of approval to the Communist regime we say to them, in effect, "We now abandon you and write you off, as men who believe in the same type of freedom as the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from California believe in."

Mr. President, that is why I think the question of recognition is very important. I think we have to devise new techniques in the new era in which we live. I believe it is just as important that we hold

out hope to men like Masaryk, as we did before he died; like Petkov, before he was hanged; and like others who still remain in Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and other countries, that we do not give our stamp of approval to police-state methods.

So far as I am concerned, it may be a drastic step, but perhaps the time has come when this Government should take the initiative and withdraw its recognition from the Communist police states which are destroying the freedom and the religious liberty of the people behind the iron curtain.

I do not think we can go on with eighteenth century methods to meet this twentieth century aggression, which is a threat to freemen everywhere. That is why I say that, in addition to the points raised by the Senator from Massachusetts, I think it is vitally important that the free people of China behind the iron curtain should know there is a legal government of the Republic of China which still exists on the island of Formosa, and that ultimately once again they may be free.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So, from the point of view of the Senator from California, it is a calculated risk, to employ a term that is very frequently used, from our point of view, that we should give our moral support to the Nationalist Government in Formosa, and that we should give them our economic support, but does the Senator go so far as to say we should send military equipment, or possibly arms, if necessary?

Mr. KNOWLAND. By all means, I think so, in addition to giving them the economic support which is available under the ECA, title IV. I do not think they would need more than the amount already afforded, the \$75,000,000 made available by the Congress, and which has never been used. I have never been in favor of giving unsupervised aid. I think that was the mistake made in Greece and in other places. In my opinion, a commission should be appointed so that the people could be trained in the use of the equipment, and I believe we can do that on sound legal grounds. But I think we must also meet the issue now before us. From what I have seen, I personally believe the Chinese will defend their own freedom on the island of Formosa and that the Communists are going to have rough going. It was difficult for the Nazis to devise means for getting across the Little English Channel, and Formosa is a hundred miles from the mainland. But at the same time I think we should be giving some thought, through the United Nations or otherwise, to serving notice that we do not think it is in the interest of world peace and the security of this Nation to permit destruction to be visited upon the people of Taiwan, for whom we have some responsibility, because it has been under Japanese rule, and we ourselves put them under Chinese rule; I think it is up to us to see that they are not visited with destruction and death. Unless we are to abandon the leadership which we have assumed, in the United Nations, we should issue a declaration that there shall not be any invasion of any type or character.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the exact point the Senator has raised about the people of Formosa, who were for some 50 years under Japanese rule, does not the Senator feel that even though it involves peril, we should indicate that the Nationalist Government of China, which was a party to the war, one of our allies, was placed in temporary custody of the people of Formosa, and that we should not, prior to the consummation of a peace treaty involving the whole Far East, turn these people over to a Red Chinese Government which was not in existence and was not an ally to the American cause?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it would be very detrimental not only to the people of free China, but most detrimental to the strategic defense of the United States, to permit Formosa to fall into Communist hands.

Mr. FERGUSON. And is not one of the big factors in this whole Formosa case the fact that it should remain as it is until a peace treaty is signed and a determination is made, when the Senate of the United States would have something to say about the disposal not only of the island, but of the people of Formosa?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will ask the Senator if it is not true that the announcement made by the President of the United States would indicate that we do not have a bipartisan foreign policy so far as the Pacific is concerned?

Mr. KNOWLAND. We have never had a bipartisan foreign policy in the Pacific.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the President has made a declaration that we do not have a bipartisan policy. The newspapers have announced that the Secretary of State is to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee next Tuesday, but it will then be too late for Congress to enter into the question of what our policy should be so far as Formosa is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not quite agree with the able Senator from Michigan on that point. I may be wrong, no one knows, but my personal observation, from meeting with various groups of people, is that there is an intuitive reaction on the part of the American public that under American policy things have not gone well in the Far East. I do not say that the American public, or a majority of it, has come to any conclusion as of today as to the policy that should be followed, but I do believe there is a growing feeling throughout the Nation that the administration's policy in the Far East has become bankrupt, that it has not been consistent with the policy we have tried to follow in Europe, and that public opinion in this country, if properly aroused, may even be able to change the viewpoint of a small group of willful men in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department who have been largely responsible for the debacle which has taken place in China.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will say to the Senator from California that I share that hope. It is true that hope springs eternal in the human breast. We should encourage the men who are on Formosa today to stand by and defend Formosa not only against internal revolution but against external aggression. Let us hope that the time may come when the Congress and the people of America will see fit to aid these people who fought on the side of the Americans in the Pacific. We should encourage them to hold on, for things may change. The policy announced today, while very encouraging to the Reds should not cause them to give up. It must be encouraging to the Chinese Reds, who have Russia on their side and, as the evidence shows, are receiving direct aid from Russia, to feel that the United States has said, "There will be no intervention so far as America is concerned." While that is true, and it is very discouraging to those who are now on Formosa trying to defend it, I am satisfied, after talking to the men in charge there, that theirs will be a stand to the death, and that they will not, even though we have forsaken them today according to the announcement from the White House, fail to stand by to defend that island until sometime when peace may come and justice may be brought to them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that if today a message can go to the embattled island of Formosa to make up for the tremendous discouragement which those defending it must feel as the result of the President's announcement that he is to abandon them and follow the policy laid down by the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, it is my personal conviction that the men on that island who want human freedom will continue to make use of that secret weapon which is not understood by Communists any place in the world, and that is the desire of men to be free. On numerous occasions in China on the continent, and in Formosa, I told the Chinese the story of George Washington at Valley Forge; how we in the early times of our history had men who were poorly equipped, whose feet were bare in the snow, who did not have either shelter or the proper arms, and that no doubt there were great and proud nations in Europe at that time who were willing to write off the Americans after that winter at Valley Forge. But I told them that with the determination to be free they carried on until we were able to found this Republic and become one of the great nations of the world.

I am convinced that today there are men in China and on the island of Formosa, who love human freedom no less than we love human freedom, and whose battle to keep outside of the Communist orbit is entitled to the help and respect of freemen everywhere, and although they may have been sold down the river into slavery by the President of the United States and the State Department, I believe there is still a tremendous reservoir of good will for the free people of China among the American people, who are not going to sit complacently by with-

out at least giving the Chinese their moral support in the great battle they now face to keep outside the iron curtain.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true also that in a republic such as ours public opinion should have something to do with the framing of our foreign policy, as to what it is and should be, and that, therefore, if we in America will raise our voices, if the public will express its opinion, we will encourage those who are standing with their backs to the wall on little Formosa, who have a desire for freedom and liberty, and that our moral support will encourage them to stand as Washington and his men stood at Valley Forge? Numbers do not always resolve a struggle. The determination to do or die for the cause may bring victory. Does not the Senator believe public opinion in America can make itself felt in such a way as to bring encouragement to those defending Formosa?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There have been other dark days so far as human freedom is concerned. Dunkerque was one of them. There have been many others in the history of the world. We did not abandon our friends in Great Britain because the going looked tough. We did not abandon the free people of Europe because the Dutch had been overrun in 5 days, the Belgians had been overrun in 7 days and had lost all their equipment, the mighty French Army had completely surrendered with all their equipment in a matter of a few weeks. We did not lose our interest in human freedom at that time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to commend the able Senator from California for the position he has followed in the Senate of the United States respecting the foreign policy affecting the western democracies of Europe.

I have listened to most of the able address delivered by the Senator today. I agree with some of the things he has said, and disagree with other things he has said.

One of the themes running through the debate is the statement that we cannot permit Formosa to fall into the hands of the Chinese Communists. I certainly hope that Formosa will not fall into the hands of the Chinese Communists. But in view of the trip the Senator from California took to the Orient last year, and in view of the fact that he must have talked to military leaders and prominent governmental officials over there, I wish to ask him, What is the minimum amount of military strength we would have to furnish in order to keep the Communists out of Formosa? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that that is a pertinent question and is entitled to an answer. It is the belief of the Senator from California that the needs of the Chinese National Government, in order to prevent a successful Communist assault certainly

during the year of 1950, could be met within the limits of the existing legislation on the statute books. If, in addition to that aid, the people there knew that they had some moral support from this great Republic across the seas, that we feel now, as we have historically felt, that we have very close and friendly ties with the Chinese people, they would be encouraged.

Responsible soldiers in the Army of China told me that the greatest blow to the morale of the Nationalist Army of China was the issuance of the American white paper. They said it did more to undermine morale, and destroy the confidence of the people in their Government at a time when they were with their backs to the wall, than anything else that had happened. So if they receive some moral encouragement, plus the funds which are already available under existing statutes, I believe that during the year 1950 at least Formosa could be defended by the Chinese themselves.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I know the Senator is quite tired, but I should like to ask one or two more questions, if I may. Can the Senator tell me, from the information he obtained on the island of Formosa, how many troops they have there at the present time, and what the nature of the military equipment is, and so forth?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I could tell the Senator, but I have no intention here in the public session of the Senate, which is open to the representatives of Tass and the Russian Government, who would pass it on to the Chinese Communists to reveal what the defense potentials are on the island of Formosa. I am sure the Senator will excuse me.

Mr. LUCAS. No, I would not want the Senator to do that. But the Senator has told a number of things here this afternoon which I thought might just as well have been said next Tuesday before the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. The Senator has served in the Army. I think I know the problems of security. I think I know the line between reasonable security and an attempt merely to lower an iron curtain, so as to keep the Congress of the United States, the representatives of the American people, from having information to which it is entitled.

But when it comes to giving out statements as to the number of troops, the weapons they have, or the weapons they need, I think that is a security matter which I would not undertake on my own responsibility to discuss in an open meeting.

Mr. LUCAS. I wholly agree with the Senator.

One more question, if I may ask it of the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield further to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the distinguished Senator from California, he is not in favor of sending any sub-

stantial military force into the island of Formosa to defend it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California has never advocated sending any force into the island of Formosa to defend it. I have been advocating that the legal Government of China be given the aid which will permit them to defend that island.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of that answer, let me say that in the letter which the Honorable Herbert Hoover, the distinguished former President of the United States, wrote to the Senator from California—Mr. Hoover says:

It is my strong belief that we should not recognize the Communist Government of China; that we must continue to recognize and support the National Government; that we should, if necessary, give naval protection to the possessions of Formosa, the Pescadores, and possibly Hainan Islands.

What does the Senator understand the former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, means by the words "giving naval protection"—to the three islands described in the letter, which the Communists of China are threatening to conquer?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator from Illinois—and of course the former able President of the United States can speak for himself as to what he means—that I think his letter is clear. Apparently he may have in mind that in a matter which affects the strategic defense and future security of the American people, it is not the part of wisdom to permit the strategic defense of this Nation to be jeopardized; and I rather imagine that Mr. Hoover would feel—although I am not authorized, of course, to speak for him—as some of the rest of us might feel, that in a matter dealing with the strategic defense of this country, the viewpoint of General MacArthur, the supreme commander in the Far East, and of Admiral Radford and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and of others, should be followed when it comes to the question of the strategic defense of this country, rather than to follow an anonymous committee in the State Department who may have very little knowledge of the strategic needs affecting the defense of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. That hardly answers the question, but I am not going to get into a discussion with the able Senator from California about what General MacArthur thinks should be done in the Pacific, because I do not know. Perhaps the Senator from California does know what General MacArthur thinks about Formosa.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would not the Senator from Illinois think that it would be wise for the State Department to find out what he thinks? Would not the Senator from Illinois think it would be wise for the State Department to find out what Admiral Radford, the CWCAPAC—the commander in chief in the Pacific—thinks about Formosa? Would not the Senator from Illinois think it would be wise for the State Department to base its decision upon what the Joint Chiefs of Staff may think, rather than to send to all our embassy employees and State

Department employees the flat-footed statement that Formosa has no strategic value?

I say, on my responsibility as a Senator of the United States, that that is a misleading statement and it is purely the statement of men who are not charged with the strategic defense of the United States of America; and I say it is a rather sad day in the history of our country when people can send out a message such as that, and completely ignore those who are charged with the responsibility of the strategic defense of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not sure that I can answer the Senator's statement, because the Senator from California may know more about what General MacArthur has said and what Admiral Radford has said and what the Joint Chiefs of Staff have said than I do; he may know more about that than the State Department does or the President of the United States does.

But I will say, on my own responsibility, that any decision the President of the United States has made has been made after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It may be different from what Admiral Radford or General MacArthur thinks about what should be done in the Pacific, but the decision made was based upon consultation with the best military men in the Government.

Mr. President, I rose primarily to find out whether the Senator from California agrees with former President Hoover that a naval force should be sent to those islands in the Pacific, and also whether the Senator agrees with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who has made a similar statement. These suggestions by such prominent Americans have caused much consternation throughout the country. I was very happy to find the Senator from California speaking of sending only a token force, or perhaps some sort of a mission over there to help the Chinese, if we send anybody at all. The Senator says he does not want to send a military force, and that he certainly does not want to send the Navy over there.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask the Senator from Illinois to wait a moment, please. If he will permit me to interrupt, let me say that, to the contrary, I think the Navy of the United States in the Pacific has been degutted. I think one of the reasons why we are at such a low point in prestige in the Pacific is because of the fact that we have permitted our Navy to get down to such a small force.

Mr. LUCAS. That has nothing at all to do with the point I am discussing. The question of whether our Navy has been degutted has nothing to do with my question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It certainly has.

Mr. LUCAS. The sole question is whether the Senator from California believes the President of the United States should send a force to protect the island—a force which Mr. Hoover in his letter says should be sent. It is not a question of whether the Senator thinks the Navy has been degutted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will answer the question, if the Senator will permit me

to do so: I think the Senate should know, and the entire Congress should know, whether it is the judgment of the supreme commander in the Far East, and the judgment of our other officials charged with the national defense, that the loss of Formosa into unfriendly hands would jeopardize the security of this country.

I am in favor of our having the Navy out there and serving notice that we will not permit carnage and destruction on the island of Formosa, and will not permit the island to be occupied by an unfriendly power. I have said that I think we should proceed to do that through the United Nations, because I think the United Nations has a responsibility in not permitting the spread of carnage to the island of Formosa, when that island's final, legal disposition depends upon the Japanese peace treaty. But certainly if it adversely affects the strategic defense of the United States, I am not in favor of letting the strategic defense of the United States be adversely affected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I claim the floor for just a moment in my own time.

I wish to reiterate what I said a moment ago about my distinguished friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], with respect to his adherence to the foreign policy of this country, so far as concerns the many, many battles we have had on the floor of the Senate in connection with aid to the democracies of western Europe; and I do not for a moment question the sincerity of the Senator from California with respect to the position he now takes regarding Formosa.

But, Mr. President, I wish to say that in my opinion the letter which was written by a former President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, advocating that we send our Navy to protect Formosa, the Pescadores, and the Hainan Islands, the letter which the able Senator from California made a part of the RECORD, has stirred up a tremendous amount of consternation in this Nation in regard to what should be done in respect to those islands. The able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], supports the same thing which the former President of the United States advocates. People are alarmed as a result of statements by such responsible persons that we ought to send our Navy to protect those islands. These spokesmen do not want to send a small military mission to these islands to help the remaining Chinese who are now on Formosa, in the civil war that is going on over there; they desire to send substantial aid.

Mr. President, any time we send any part of the United States Fleet to any of those islands, to protect them, we can prepare to send more auxiliary military and naval equipment. It is agreed here by the Senator from California, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and by other Senators that the Communists are bound and determined to take over Formosa. If that is their plan, Mr. President, I undertake to say that this country by even intimating that it is going to send its fleet there to protect those islands would be following a most dangerous course. If we send the Navy

over there, we must send more. If we are going to follow the course the former President of the United States suggests, we must augment that force with at least 10 crack divisions to be garrisoned on the island of Formosa. If we are going to send the Navy over there, we had better get ready to send hundreds of airplanes also and all the equipment that is necessary to take care of them. That is exactly what we must do if we are going to protect and defend the island, as suggested by the former President of the United States and by the senior Senator from Ohio.

I undertake to say that if we pursue such a dangerous policy we must admit that we will become a participant in the civil war now raging in China. Mr. President, if we intervene with military force in the present civil war in China, we should prepare for world war III.

Mr. President, I am more interested in undertaking to work out these matters through the United Nations, for if there is another war both the victor and the vanquished will go down to defeat.

We have had a foreign policy in the Pacific, notwithstanding the position to the contrary taken by some Senators. We have had a foreign policy in Japan. We have had it in Indonesia. We have had it in Korea. We have had it all through the East. It has not worked out in China as we should have liked, of course; but we have had a foreign policy, and those who say we have not, those who say it is bankrupt, do not realize the progress which has been made in the East as the result of our foreign policy. It is apparent in the Philippines, in Japan, in Korea, in Indonesia, and in other spots in that section of the world.

I did not expect to speak upon this subject, Mr. President, but when the saying is repeated, "Formosa must not fall into the hands of an unfriendly foe," something more than talking about it must be done, if we want to keep it from falling into the hands of the Communists. I do not know what the military strength of the island is. Perhaps the Senator from California knows. Perhaps the committee can find out. Perhaps they can find out when they go into session next Tuesday, when the Secretary of State appears before the committee. The Foreign Relations Committee ought to find out, of course, and it will. But someone knows that the military strength of Formosa is not very great; someone has been told that is so; otherwise men like former President Hoover and the Senator from Ohio would not be advocating sending the Navy, or part of the Navy, to protect it from communism. Any time the Navy goes to Formosa, Mr. President, you can be certain that if the Communists start across some ships are going down. The chances are they will go down because of some Russian submarine that will be there, because the Communists are all together, as everyone knows. That is what I fear, Mr. President. If that should happen, we would be involved, and that could mean war—and no one is going to win the next war. I think the President of the United States followed the right course in the action he took

today, in expressing the position he did in the statement. I am not so sure that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are right in the advocacy of the policy they have been proposing. Time alone will tell.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to ask the Senator, since he has made the statement that the administration has a foreign policy in the Far East, if he could give me and also give the public an answer to the question of why we have not had a bipartisan foreign policy in the Far East.

Mr. LUCAS. A bipartisan policy?

Mr. JENNER. Yes—why the bipartisan foreign policy that has applied to western Europe has not been applied to the Far East.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Texas would be in a better position to answer that question than am I; but I think perhaps his Committee on Foreign Relations has been advised from time to time as to what is going on in the Far East. I am not fully advised as to what department officials the committee has called before it and the extent of the information elicited. But I want to say to my friend from Indiana that the Senator from Illinois has advocated from time to time, and still does, the maximum amount of consultation and conference between the executive branch of the Government and members of the Foreign Relations Committee, both in the Senate and in the House. That is the position I have taken from the beginning. I still take that position.

I think my friend, the great Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], has made a valuable contribution toward world peace, as a result of the position he has taken and his efforts here in promoting the bipartisan foreign policy as he has done and is doing now. He and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] have been the architects of the bipartisan foreign policy. They have worked together all these years. The results of their work have become evident in Europe. But what happened in the Chinese situation I am not in a position to say. I shall leave that to the experts on the subject.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The able majority leader has stated that America has a foreign policy in the East. I wonder whether the Senator would place in the RECORD today or tomorrow a statement of what that policy is. The Senator from Michigan spent some time in the East, and he endeavored to obtain from those who are in charge of formulating the policy of America in the East, those who are in charge of the naval forces in the East, and so forth, that information. He was unable to find anyone who could state what the foreign policy of America was in relation to the East. That being true, I should like to have the able majority leader state to the Senate what the foreign policy of America is in the East.

Mr. LUCAS. The junior Senator from Michigan is a very valuable Member of the Senate. He understands the situation as well as I do. I suggest to the able Senator that he ask permission to go before Secretary Acheson next Tuesday and ask him that question. The Secretary of State can give him the proper answer. The Senator from Illinois could not lay out on a blueprint as to what the foreign policy is, unless he conferred with the Secretary and with State Department officials. But I know, and the Senator knows, that we have a foreign policy there. I am satisfied from the accounts I read in the newspapers as to where the Senator went on the last trip he took, that he was not trying very hard to find out exactly what our foreign policy was in the Far East, but that he was trying to find something wrong with it. The Senator did not go over there to find out anything good about the Democratic administration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. Any question the Senator would ask me would not be favorable to the Democratic administration. I know that from my long experience with the Senator's activities.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator give me his aid, that I may appear before the Foreign Relations Committee, and that I may ask that question?

Mr. LUCAS. Why, certainly. I know his distinguished senior colleague from Michigan would be delighted to have the junior Senator from Michigan appear in the committee meeting and ask all the questions he wants to ask. It has been done before. Former Senator Dulles was here last year. He was a sort of roving member of the committee. There will not be any trouble about that at all, and I think the Senator ought to do it. Of course, no one will ever satisfy the Senator with respect to his questions, but at least he will have the opportunity to interrogate Secretary Acheson. He ought to do it. I know the Secretary would welcome it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator was critical of the statement of former President Hoover, as supported by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I assume without any question that the Senator did not mean by his criticism that those men, or any other prominent men, or even men who are not so prominent, do not have the right to speak out and give their views with relation to the policies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, not at all. I may say to my dear friend from Massachusetts that the Senator from Ohio would be the last man in the world anyone would attempt to keep from speaking out. They have that right, of course, as citizens, and the Senator from Ohio has that right as a Senator. I do not say that Mr. Hoover or the Senator from Ohio wants to get this country into war. I do not say that at all, but I do definitely and unequivocally say that, once we send the Navy to Formosa to keep the Com-

munists away, as was clearly suggested in that letter and in the statement that was made by the distinguished Senator, it is certainly placing the American people and the American Government in a dangerous position, so far as war is concerned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one more question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator will agree with me, I am sure, that it is for the best interests of all the Members of the United States Senate and of the American people as a whole to have men like President Hoover, the Senator from California, the Senator from Ohio, and others, who have some knowledge of the subject, and who have definite views, to express their views in order that all of us can get better information. The Senator agrees with me about that, does he not?

Mr. LUCAS. That is absolutely correct. I agree to that, that the more debate we have upon the subject, the more opportunity we shall have of giving the American people the opportunity to listen in and to hear both sides of the question, and of finding a proper solution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And that is not on a partisan basis, I take it.

Mr. LUCAS. Not at all, not at all.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate at this time. I shall probably address some remarks to this subject at a little later date. The hour is far advanced. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the able speech by the Senator from California, and to the running debate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has pointed out the statements of former President Hoover and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] advocating the sending of a naval fleet to Formosa. I have a press release before me from New Brunswick, N. J., quoting a statement by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who was recently in the Far East. I quote from the press release:

This country should lose no time in adopting an aggressive policy in the Far East, including the occupation of Formosa to forestall a possible Communist sweep southward out of China.

Senator ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, declared tonight in a recorded broadcast:

"I am hoping we will find a formula for occupying Formosa," said Mr. SMITH. "I think that it would be very simple to work out a program with the Nationalist Government there and with Taiwan."

That is, Formosa—

"with the people themselves, whereby we would go into a joint occupation and help them to recover."

Why, of course, it would be a simple operation—much simpler than this debate here today—if we would cooperate with the forces occupying Formosa, and tell them that we are going to come over and help occupy it. Occupy it how? With an army, with a navy, with all the military might this Government possesses?

Mr. President, I was somewhat amazed at the Senator from California when,

after his long address about the terrible conditions in the Far East and the threat of communism, he did not go further into the aggressive measures which he thought might be adopted in order to stop communism. Of course, we are all against communism. The Senator denounces the methods of the Communists. But because we are against communism must we send an army into all the Communist states, to conquer communism, extirpate it, and liberate the peoples from communism? What are we going to do, if we follow that sort of policy? When are we going to invade Hungary, to free it from communism? Rumania? Bulgaria? Czechoslovakia? Yugoslavia? And Russia itself? Shall we say we will not permit communism to exist anywhere on earth?

Mr. President, the Communists have taken possession of China. We should not blind ourselves to that fact. They are in de facto possession of all the land area of China excepting certain outlying islands. The great nations of the earth are about to recognize the Communists as de facto rulers of China. What good will it do us, even if we could—and we should not—to intervene in the civil war between the Communists on the one hand and the Nationalist Government of China on the other hand?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the statement made by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that the great nations of the earth are about to recognize the Communist government of China, may I inquire if it is the intention of the Government of the United States to recognize the Communist government of China?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is a matter which must await developments. It will not be determined at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to get into any quarrel with the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. All right. The State Department has repeatedly informed the committee that there will be no recognition until the matter is discussed with the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me further answer the Senator's question. It is not the custom to recognize a government until it gives assurances that it will respect international law. That is applicable to all governments.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate now tell us what great nations of the earth are going to recognize Communist China?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know them all. I know some of them. India has recognized Communist China. Great Britain, I think—

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know that Great Britain will recognize Communist China?

Mr. CONNALLY. I feel sure that she will recognize it. She has vast business interests in China and wants to protect

them. I understand that within a very short period of time she will recognize the Communist government of China.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator think the United States of America should recognize a country which will be governed by Communist Russia, with all its banditry, which has infiltrated itself not only into China but into many other countries? Can it ever become so stabilized that the United States of America will recognize that kind of government?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator is getting a little far afield from the absolute question which we are supposed to be discussing here.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator made the statement that great nations of the earth were about to recognize Communist China.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say they all would recognize China.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator because I believe in him. I think he believes in fair play. I ask him now as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, does he think the Senate of the United States can agree to ratification by the State Department of recognition of Communist China if this administration shall decide to recognize Communist China?

Mr. CONNALLY. The State Department cannot recognize it. No one except the President of the United States can extend recognition.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not sufficiently acquainted with all the facts regarding conditions in China to make a definite statement, but I do not favor recognizing China at this time. As I have said, it depends on conditions and developments. Ultimately, if they show themselves as properly administering the affairs of China, we shall probably recognize them. What good would it do not to recognize them? If other countries of the world recognize them, do business with them, and have ministers and ambassadors stationed there, how would it benefit us not to have ambassadors and ministers there also? We do not send ambassadors to foreign countries to please the people of those countries. We do not send ministers and consuls to serve the convenience or the pleasure of foreign governments. We send them to represent and serve the Government of the United States. We want to know what is going on in those countries. We have no other way of ascertaining, without establishing an elaborate spy system. We refused to recognize Russia for approximately 15 years after the First World War. What difference did it make? The rest of the nations of the world traded and did business with Russia, and so did we, but we had no formal diplomatic representation. Finally we did recognize Russia, and she was then absolutely a Communist government. If the Senator would not recognize any Communist government at all, and that were our policy, we would soon be in a very small minority, judging by the way in which communism is spreading over the world.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. How can the distinguished Senator from Texas ask the junior Senator from Nebraska to vote appropriations to stop the expansion of communism in western Europe while at the same time this administration recognizes Communist China?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not yet asked the Senator to support any appropriations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator has been on the floor of the Senate and, in an impassioned plea, has asked us to approve this, that, or the other thing to stop the expansion of communism in Europe. This afternoon we are informed by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that the great nations of the earth are about to recognize Communist China. I ask once again how the Senator can ask that we spend the taxpayers' money to stop communism in Europe. How can I be asked to approve an appropriation to stop the expansion of communism in Europe, when, at the same time the Government advocates the recognition of Communist China or any other nation where bandits infiltrate and completely subjugate the people?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nebraska has answered the question. He has asked it and answered it, so I shall not pay any more attention to that particular question. But let me ask the Senator this: What are the nations of the earth which we have recognized? Do not rise until I have completed my question. I want a little time, myself. I have never made a plea on the floor of the Senate for appropriations to stop communism. I have made appeals for appropriations to protect free nations of the earth from armed attack from without, regardless of communism—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. Be patient, please. The clock is running on. Let me say to the Senator, seriously, that this is a free country, is it not?

Mr. WHERRY. I hope so.

Mr. CONNALLY. If a man wants to be a Communist, has he not the right to be a Communist? In a free land if a citizen honestly and sincerely believes in the principles of communism but violates no law he has a right to his belief.

Mr. WHERRY. The oath of the Communist Party provides for the overthrow of the United States Government by force.

Mr. CONNALLY. If a Communist violates the law, of course he is guilty—he is responsible for his own conduct. He may not be a member of the party.

Mr. WHERRY. He is guilty of treason.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not necessarily.

Mr. WHERRY. If he advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States, it is treason. I shall not support appropriations for anyone who believes in that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will bet a dollar that if we should send an FBI investigator into Nebraska he would find some

Communists. I do not mean armed Communists.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment—

Mr. CONNALLY. I have the floor, and I propose to keep it until I get ready to yield it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is charging that there are Communists in Nebraska. Nebraska has the finest citizenship on the face of the earth. They are honest-to-goodness Americans. They are not Communists.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not mean that all of them are Communists.

Mr. WHERRY. Nebraska is the best State in the Union, and the Senator will find more Americans to the square inch in Nebraska than in any other State of the Union.

Mr. CONNALLY. They are getting pretty small if they can be compressed into a square inch.

Mr. WHERRY. They are doing pretty well.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, what I meant to say was that if men honestly believe in those doctrines—and there are plenty of such men in every State—they are not going around with a bomb in one hand and a six-shooter in the other. They really believe in the principle of the common ownership of property.

Mr. WHERRY. But the Senator does not sanction those beliefs.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course I do not.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator and I agree on most questions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have answered the question of the Senator from Nebraska. But I want the gentlemen who are complaining so bitterly and so eloquently and so vigorously about Formosa to tell us what they want to do about it.

Mr. JENNER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. What do they propose to do? Do they want to send an army there with guns in their hands? Do they want to send the Navy, with its flags unfurled, to protect Formosa in a civil war? Both sides in this contest are Chinese. The Nationalist Government is Chinese, and the Communist forces are Chinese. It is a civil war, and we do not intervene in civil wars unless our interests are directly affected.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas whether or not the President of the United States consulted with the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in regard to this recently announced policy on the abandonment of Formosa.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say that the President did not personally, but the Secretary of State did.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. And he is in constant touch with the President.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator to say they consulted with the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. CONNALLY. Members of it. They consulted with me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Rela-

tions, and I never heard anything about this decision until I saw it in the newspapers.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations if he does not think it somewhat strange that some of the Senators who have so bitterly opposed our efforts to assist western Europe now seem to be in the forefront in behalf of some policy, which they do not define, which they do not delimit, and which they cannot explain. Has the Senator observed that?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not like to reflect on my colleagues. The Senator is entitled to his opinion on the subject.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to say to the Senator also that the effort that has been made here today to prove that we have had no policy in the Far East does not comport with the facts.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly it does not.

Mr. McMAHON. As the Senator well knows, we poured hundreds of millions of dollars into the Philippines.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. We started right after the end of the war to see that they maintained their independence, and became a free republic among the nations of the world.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator knows we did our job in Japan, and I think have done it very well, and that we are working on a peace treaty with Japan.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Texas knows, and the Senate knows, that we have rendered invaluable assistance to the Indonesian Republic, and for the first time in years there is now a cessation of hostilities in Indonesia.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Texas knows, and the Senate knows, that we have taken the lead in composing the differences between Pakistan and India. Last of all, the Senator of course knows well that we have poured more than \$2,000,000,000 into the effort to maintain the Nationalist Government in China.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. Let us acknowledge the corn, as the saying goes. Do gentlemen want us to go into Formosa with a full-fledged attack? Do they want us to go to war over China, or do they not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for his question. What he implies is very true. Let us consider the case of China. We are talking about China and Formosa. We poured out more than \$2,000,000,000, and sent the Chinese food and raiment. We sent arms and munitions to Nationalist China, the government which is being discussed here today. We sent them all these things. If they did not use them successfully, it is not the fault of the United States.

What we did for Indonesia has been well suggested by the Senator. What about Japan? We have occupied Japan. We have fed the Japanese, we have sent them money, we have sent them resources. Yet, we have no policy! I have heard that kind of talk from across the aisle for some years, that we have no foreign policy. It is ridiculous on its face.

We poured hundreds of millions of dollars into the Philippines? And what occurred in the case of Korea? We are making appropriations for Korea. It is making great advancement and progress. Yet, we have no foreign policy!

Mr. President, when war was on, did we have a foreign policy? Did we not send troops to China? Did we not send troops to Burma? Did we not send troops to India? Did we not send troops to Japan? Did we not send them to practically all the governments in Asia that had any contact at all with the war? We sent American troops, American resources, American arms and munitions. Yet, we have no foreign policy!

Aid to China is still proceeding. Even with all the disturbance China is causing us, we are still continuing to administer money for relief purposes in China.

Mr. WHERRY. Through ECA.

Mr. CONNALLY. Through ECA; yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. For a short question.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator about the ECA appropriations, but I should like to inquire whether we allocated any of the \$75,000,000 Congress appropriated for aid in China. Have we spent any of that \$75,000,000?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot tell the Senator how much has been spent, but aid is being extended.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the aid about which the Senator from California has been talking.

Mr. CONNALLY. We gave them \$125,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. One hundred and seventy-five million dollars has been spent of the ECA funds out of \$275,000,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am speaking about another appropriation.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator that that is being spent, but, as I understand from all the reports I can get from the State Department, not one dime or penny of the \$75,000,000 that was appropriated, the bill passing the Senate without much debate, has been spent, and if I understood the remarks of the Senator from California correctly, it is my understanding that out of the authorization, the aid they need so much could be given without any further legislative action.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. For just a moment let me answer. This seems to be a squad attack. We appropriated \$125,000,000 for aid to China in the way of arms, ammunition, and munitions.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I asked the distinguished majority leader a question a while ago, and he said he thought the Senator from Texas might be in a better position to answer.

I agree with the distinguished Senator, we have a foreign policy in the Far East, and we have a bipartisan foreign policy in western Europe. Will the Senator be kind enough to explain to me why we do not have a bipartisan foreign policy in the Far East?

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as I know, there has been no concealment from members of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the Republican side about any fact in issue as to China. The Senator from Nebraska, the leader on the other side, pretends to know more about these things than many of the rest of us know.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not get my information from the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I did not get it from the State Department. I cannot find out anything from the State Department.

Mr. CONNALLY. He got it from one of his secret agents, then.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what one has to have around here to get any information.

Mr. CONNALLY. One of his secret agents, paid for by Government money.

Mr. JENNER. Then the distinguished Senator from Texas is telling me that we have the same bipartisan policy in the Far East that we have in Europe, that it is bipartisan all through?

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as I have been able to observe. The two-billion-dollar appropriation made for China was voted for on this floor. Were the Republicans so blind that they did not inquire into it, that they did not know what the \$2,000,000,000 was being spent for? Was the \$175,000,000 about which the Senator from Nebraska speaks—and I hope he will keep his seat until I get to a stopping point—covered up? Was it not passed on the floor of the Senate, and are not the Republicans smart enough to inquire and to know about it in years when there is no election, as well as in years when there is an election?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator recall that there were consistent and persistent attempts made by members of the Committee on Foreign Relations to get hold of the Wedemeyer report and see what was in it?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And that we were met with full and unconditional refusal by the State Department?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is a vivid illustration of the bipartisan nature of the policy. The Democrats did not get the Wedemeyer report any more than the Republicans got it. So there is no point to that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Bipartisan secrecy, I take it.

Mr. CONNALLY. No. The Wedemeyer report touched a great many matters of a highly technical, military, and

diplomatic nature, so that the President did not think it wise to give it publicity, and he knew that if he gave it to as many as three Republicans, it would be published all over the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to say for the RECORD that, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, it is a great regret to me to be compelled to announce here that I was in no way consulted about the action taken by the President today. Furthermore, I had understood distinctly, in my conversations with the members of the State Department, that no action would be taken on these important questions, such as the recognition of China and the problem of Formosa, without consultation with the Committee on Foreign Relations. I want the RECORD to show that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to say also, in answer to the distinguished chairman of the committee, for whom I have the highest affection and regard, with respect to his question to me about what I would do regarding Formosa, that I expect to address the Senate early next week, reporting on my trip, and making suggestions about how the Formosa matter might be handled without the danger of war. Possibly it is too late. Possibly the barn door has been locked after the horse is gone, because I understand the question has been settled unilaterally by the President on the advice of the Department today, much to my regret.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know where or when the President gave assurances to the Senator from New Jersey that action respecting China would be revealed to him. He told all of us in the committee, through the Secretary of State, that recognition—and we are not discussing recognition here today—that recognition of the Communist regime in China would not be made until the Foreign Relations Committee was thoroughly conversant with and was advised of the situation. That stands, and continues to stand.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. From discussion of the bipartisan approach to this matter and talking with members of the State Department, I understood distinctly that these issues would be considered in a bipartisan way, and that no action would be taken without consultation with the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. I, as one Senator at least, had that understanding. I think it is a dangerous attack upon our bipartisan cooperation for this unilateral decision by the President to have been made. I greatly regret it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to ask what we would have done respecting the foreign policy of the United States when the Senator from New Jersey was away in India, in China, and Formosa? What would be the result if no action could be

taken until he and the other Senators who were away returned and were consulted?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the RECORD will show that I said that, from talking with members of the State Department, I understood that no action would be taken on these important questions, such as the recognition of China and the problem of Formosa without consultation with the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. There are many men in the State Department who have no authority to make such a statement. The Senator from New Jersey did not consult the President or the Secretary of State about the statements he handed out about what ought to happen to Formosa, did he?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I certainly did. On my return I immediately tried to get in touch with the Secretary of State, and was told that he was leaving for Paris. He asked me to submit a memorandum to him on the subject of my observations in the Far East. I did so. He acknowledged receipt of the memorandum. I immediately sent to the other members of the State Department involved in far eastern affairs a copy of my report to the Foreign Relations Committee and asked for a consultation with them. I did have lunch with Mr. Butterworth. I went to Flushing and had lunch with Messrs. Jessup and Fosdick and reported my recommendations to them. I felt I was entitled to some opportunity of discussing with the entire State Department group what should be done in deciding these important questions. I cannot feel that any of my observations or recommendations were given any serious consideration.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if he can advise the Senate whether, in consideration of Chinese affairs, including the possibility of recognition of the present powers in control of China, the island of Formosa is regarded as a part of China?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say "Yes." It has not been confirmed by a treaty of peace with Japan, but insofar as they can make these agreements short of a treaty with Japan, the powers agreed that Formosa should go back to China, because Japan seized it 50 or 60 years ago. However, the treaty ratifying that agreement must be made.

Mr. AIKEN. Was that agreement made since the conclusion of World War II?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. It was made during the war, at the Cairo Conference.

Mr. AIKEN. I assume the Government of China was one of the major powers that agreed to that decision.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. And probably would not agree to it at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator mean that China would rather Japan would keep Formosa than that Japan return it to China?

Mr. AIKEN. I imagine that China would not, that is that Chiang Kai-shek's

government would not desire to have Formosa regarded as a part of China.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is a speculation I am not able to answer.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator did answer my question, that, so far as he knows, the island of Formosa is regarded as a part of China.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The statement has been made that my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who has taken such an important part in foreign relations, had personally been consulted in relation to Formosa. My colleague issued a statement which I think should be made a part of the RECORD to show whether or not there was consultation with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I should like to read into the RECORD the statement issued by my distinguished colleague and released to the press this afternoon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Senator the permission of the senior Senator from Michigan to place the statement in the RECORD?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but I think it ought to become a part of the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not going to object. I merely wanted to know.

Mr. FERGUSON. The senior Senator from Michigan delivered to the press a statement. It came over the teletype service. I read a copy of the statement, as follows:

Senator VANDENBERG. I regret that the administration has found it necessary to announce conclusions regarding Formosa ahead of a realistic consultation on the subject with the appropriate committees of Congress. Like Yalta and Potsdam, and like many other unhappy chapters in China policy, congressional advice is precluded. I regret that these conclusions also precede the factual reports which have been anticipated from the Jessup mission and particularly from the Far East conference between our Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur. It is at least useful that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will explore the subject with Secretary Acheson next week because many critical decisions remain to be made.

Every practical discouragement to Communist conquest, short of active American military participation, should be pursued in China and throughout the Far East, which must be totally encompassed in our comprehensive view. The rights of Formosans themselves must be consulted. The permanent status of Formosa must be recognized as dependent on the ultimate Japanese peace treaty. The vital interest of the United Nations must be recognized.

The Formosan question is presently clarified but it is not settled by today's executive statements. I withhold my own discussion until the belated hearings next week.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am very glad to have that statement from the senior Senator from Michigan. The senior Senator from Michigan is a very able man. He has rendered very distinguished service. He is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I want to say, however, that the Committee on Foreign Relations has had Mr. Acheson before it numerous times. He has never shown any disposition not

to come when any member of the committee felt that we ought to invite him, and when the committee had acted favorably upon such a suggestion. He has been frank. He has been free to discuss any foreign questions. I think it is a little unfair to charge the State Department, through Mr. Acheson, with lack of willingness to reveal anything that is known about the subject.

Now some say that we ought to wait until we receive the report from Mr. Jessup.

Many persons have traveled over eastern Asia, including Japan, who have given out statements respecting what they thought ought to be done in Formosa, and what ought to be done in Korea. After a while the issuance of such statements becomes an old matter, and I assume that the Secretary of State and the President concluded that it was about time that one or the other of them should make a public statement in regard to our policy toward Formosa. One cannot blame them.

We have heard speeches on the Senate floor, not only during the present session but during the last session, about China, and particularly we have heard complaints respecting our policy toward China. Yet, the same persons who have complained the loudest about our neglect of China voted for the appropriations, liberal appropriations, which we made for assistance to China. We sent General Marshall to China. He spent a year there trying to compose the Government of China, to keep it a going concern. Yet, now some say we have not done enough for China. Senators know what happened. They know what General Marshall told us. He told us about the corruption in the Government of China, and that it was unable really in good faith to carry out measures which would utilize the funds we had so lavishly given them.

I shall at a later time make a more comprehensive speech on this subject and try to be prepared to brief anyone who wants to ask questions.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it is certainly not my intention to enter into any extended discussion of this matter except to say I think it would be unfortunate if we were to close the debate without pointing out that we do have, in a very real sense, a bipartisan policy respecting China. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I have sat hour after hour and listened to exactly the same witnesses as has the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. Every suggestion that could possibly be made by the admirals, by the generals, by the ambassadors, by the special ambassadors, and by the Secretary of State, was received and examined, and out of all that testimony has come unified action by the Foreign Relations Committee. If that is not bipartisan I do not know the meaning of the term. It seems to me the Republican members of the Foreign Relations Committee have truly represented their party, have amply represented their party, and have wisely represented their party in the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. In regard to the issuance of the statement by the President, I wish to say that I am reliably informed, beyond any question, that last night the Secretary of State tried to reach the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; that he had gone home, and was not available; but that the Secretary of State was going to reach him and was going to discuss the very thing about which complaint has been made, namely, that the Senator was not consulted about the issuance of the statement by the President. I intervene simply to make that statement.

Mr. McMAHON. I regret very much that that mischance occurred.

But in regard to the issuance of the statement, I also point out that it was in the possession of the Foreign Relations Committee for months and months and months. I have not heard made in the executive meetings of that committee any positive, constructive suggestion which would have eventuated in a single difference in action or in thought in relation to this problem.

So I say to the Senator from Indiana that in a very real sense we do have, and have had up to this time, a bipartisan policy in regard to China. It might have been different if the Senator from Nebraska had been on the committee; in that case we might have taken a different position. But I would not say that it would have resulted in his taking a different position than that which he has taken in regard to ECA and the Atlantic Pact, or different from the action he has taken on this floor in regard to their implementation which, if I remember the record correctly, he was opposed. I suspect that his action on those matters would have been no different if he had been a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, I want a bipartisan foreign policy. I truly believe, from the bottom of my heart, that the position the United States of America occupies in the world today—the most important position any nation has ever occupied in relation to the other powers of the earth in the history of all mankind—is such, today, and is fraught with such danger, that never before have we needed unity in our foreign policy as we need it today.

Mr. President, I hope that we shall not become unduly acrimonious. I hope I have not offended the Senator from Nebraska in what I have said. I hope we can go on to develop and support a policy which will indicate to the world that we here are united and are determined that freedom shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that the memorandum which has been read into the RECORD this afternoon by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], giving the observation of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], corroborates entirely the charges I have made in the past few days, namely, that we do not have a bipartisan foreign policy. Furthermore, it completely vindicates me in the statement I made, that, from now on, certainly no commitments ought to be made by the State

Department on the theory of bipartisanship, until those commitments have been brought to the Foreign Relations Committee and then to the Senate of the United States and then to the American people, for debate and open discussion.

That was not done in regard to Yalta; that was not done in regard to Potsdam. If it had been done in those cases, we would not be in the trouble we are in today. There was no bipartisanship about those secret agreements; and the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said so time and time again on the floor of the Senate.

There has not been any bipartisanship on the coalition-Communist policy in the southeast of Asia for 6 years. Certainly when I voted against confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Acheson the first time, I did so because he wanted to inject a coalition Communist commission, or at least a representation of Communists in such a commission, in Japan. I did so alongside of the able former Senator Chandler, of Kentucky, who made a very forceful speech on that very proposition, on which we were in agreement at that time.

Mr. President, I opposed the ECA authorization; I thought it took the wrong approach. But I wish to tell my distinguished friend, the Senator from Connecticut, that once it was authorized, I supported the appropriations for it. I wish to say that I did not agree with the approach taken by the Atlantic Charter. I said I was in favor of the extension of the Monroe Doctrine, and that I would go along with the Atlantic Charter if that was what it was to be. But after it was authorized, when I sat on the Appropriations Committee, I attempted to justify the expenses for it, and I shall do so again.

I said then, and I now repeat, that it seems impossible to commit ourselves to a land army, to the tune of billions of dollars, to stop the expansion of communism in western Europe, when at the same time we recognize Communist China. Why are we to be expected to make those appropriations, and at the same time leave the barn door wide open to communism in China? That is my whole record on those issues, and I am proud of it.

The observations made today by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the observations made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who has been one of the most active and apt members of the Foreign Relations Committee, completely justify my position so far as a bipartisan policy is concerned.

So, Mr. President, I myself hope—and I wish to agree with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut—that when these matters come to the Senate, as they should come to it, there will be full discussion of them. Certainly there was no bipartisanship in regard to Formosa or in regard to the question of defending it. Certainly it was not my policy; I had no chance to express myself about it, and I shall not have. But I say now that if we can have open discussions and can have the Senate advised as to what the

policy shall be, then we shall have a bipartisan foreign policy which I shall be glad to uphold as forcefully as will any other Member of the Senate. But I was not consulted about Formosa. I do not know about the policy regarding it. I think some very challenging questions have been asked about what our policy should be.

But I wish to say now that, whatever that policy is, it should be arrived at after open discussion, without any commitments being made by either the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee or by the committee itself, until it can be discussed on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, perhaps it is not inappropriate that a freshman Member of the Senate should make a few observations in regard to the very enlightening discussion which has occurred today on the floor of the Senate. I am very sorry it was not my privilege to hear all the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I wish to say that it is not my purpose to argue or debate in any way with him the subject which has been under discussion.

However, as one who long has been interested in our international policy, particularly the problems of the Far East, as one who used to have the privilege of lecturing to a few students on international problems, particularly those in the Far East, I have been interested to note the lack of interest on the part of the United States Senate in what could be done for tomorrow. Everyone seems to be quite sure about what went wrong yesterday. I have heard almost continuous debate and argument about China; but China has been a lost cause ever since the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress, and even before that time. The Communist troops have been on the march; it was perfectly obvious what would happen in China.

Now we are considering Formosa, which consists of some 13,000 square miles. Perhaps it would be well for us to pick up the World Almanac and read what it states about what Formosa consists of and what articles it produces. From the almanac we learn that Formosa has an area of 13,800 square miles and a population of 5,212,426. We also learn that the Pescadores, the other islands which have been mentioned in connection with this debate, have an area of 50 square miles and a population of approximately 60,000.

But now the great question is whether we should send our fleet to Formosa or whether at least we should do something to save Formosa from communism.

Frankly, Mr. President, the issue, as has been stated, is one of civil war. One side happens to have Communist leadership; the other side happens to have corrupt leadership. Of course, corrupt leadership is still corrupt and still filled with corruption, whether it be communistic leadership or other leadership.

Now the question is whether we should do something in this civil war.

Since our policy in the Far East is in question, I should like to commend to the Foreign Relations Committee interrogations and inquiries in regard to what we

are doing, not only for Formosa and about Formosa, but also about Korea, where the government is tottering. Let us also say a word about India. For about 9 months the junior Senator from Minnesota has been digging into the facts and testimony and figures about India. Even when the great Nehru, one of the greatest leaders of all time, a disciple of Gandhi, and a saint of India, came to the United States, not one Member of the Senate of the United States rose in the Senate to give him a greeting—not even when he, a man of peace, came to our country. We have had many speeches about the United States fleet and about war, but not one speech about Nehru.

At this time I wish to talk about food. I happen to think that we stop communism more with food than we do with fleets. I think we stop the Communists in Europe more with economic aid and food than we do by supplying guns. Our program of economic aid in western Europe has been more successful than has our program of supplying guns to Greece.

Mr. President, what has happened in Asia? In Asia there is poverty such as none of us can realize. I wish the Senator from California had talked to us about the unbelievable poverty which exists in Asia. Poverty is a fertile ground for communism. The Communists have made their way in China not only because of the strength of their arms and the mismanagement of the nationalist government, but because of the abject poverty of the people of China, poverty such as is inconceivable to the western mind.

There is the nation by the name of India. How about India? Let us compare it with Formosa. Formosa has 13,000 square miles. India has 1,581,410 square miles. Formosa has 5,000,000 people, and the Formosans do not like the Nationalist Government of China. The Nationalist Government of China treated the people of Formosa so badly that they literally hate the Government of China. How about the population of India? Three hundred and eighty-eight million, nine hundred and ninety-seven thousand, nine hundred and fifty-five is the estimate of 1940. It is now openly estimated that India's population is in excess of 400,000,000, with a government friendly to us, with a government headed by the great Prime Minister Nehru, who recently visited this country, with a government that has been able to deal with communism within its own borders by stringent efforts and drastic measures. Yet how many Senators have brought to the attention of this body the fact that the Indian Government has been wanting food from America, and has not been able to get a crumb. We talk about sending a fleet, we have the saber out, and, frankly, the people of the island cannot save Formosa, as has been pointed out so well, unless we are willing to send airplanes and an Army there, and unless we are willing to have World War III.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appeal to this body to look into the facts. Everyone is concerned because the Secretary of State did not discuss Formosa. Everyone is concerned because the President did not discuss Formosa. How many Senators on the floor of the Senate are concerned about the fact that India wants 1,000 tons of wheat from America, and has not been able to get it?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. For the information of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, I may say I visited India only a few weeks ago. I think the situation will be found about as the Senator has described it. So far as poverty is concerned, it is indescribable. There is misery and pitiable suffering. I think the population will be found as the Senator has described it. It will also be found that it is increasing at the rate of 5,000,000 a year. But the people have just gone through an internal conflict based upon a religious disagreement. The Hindus, being the prominent people, could not get along with the Moslems, or vice versa, and, therefore, since England left, the new nation of Pakistan has been created.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator does not want to prolong the debate. I stand ready for a question.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator is interested in the question of food. I want to say that in Pakistan the Senate committee saw literally thousands of tons of food. The Pakistanians have been the agricultural people of that great subject nation for many hundreds of years. Nehru wanted to enter into an agreement for the purchase of grain from Pakistan. It was refused by reason of differences in Kashmir. If we send food to Nehru, we are going to destroy and starve to death 80,000,000 Pakistanians who produce the food that India should be consuming.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the information the Senator from Indiana has furnished. I shall simply say there is no amount of agricultural production in all Asia that can feed the 400,000,000 people of India. If we should take the food that is in Pakistan and add the 500,000,000 bushels of wheat we have in surplus in the United States, there still would be hungry people in India.

Mr. JENNER. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Most of the Indian people are getting along on less than one-half the subsistence diet that the United Nations has established as necessary in Europe.

Mr. President, I shall not belabor the point. I merely want to say that five times during the past year the junior Senator from Minnesota has placed in the RECORD material on the subject of our relationships, or lack of relationships, with the Dominion of India. I ask anyone who is a student of geopolitics to get his mind off Formosa—little old Formosa—and think of the great mass of land in south Asia that is India,

with the upper stretches of this land literally butting into the underbelly of the Soviet Union. On the one side, there is the Arabian Sea, on the other side, the Bay of Bengal, and on the south, the Indian Ocean. If one looks at the geopolitics, India makes out a good case. We ought to be doing something to maintain their freedom and to maintain a democratic government in that country. But we in this country do not seem to become much enthused about feeding somebody who wants to live the democratic way of life. We seem to become enthused in the United States Senate about Chiang Kai-shek, or about opposition to the Communists. We have enthusiasm now for Formosa. There are those who voted against the Atlantic Pact, which was nothing more or less than a commitment for national defense and national security, who are the very first to want to send a fleet to Formosa. Why? To stop communism.

Mr. President, I want to stop communism, and I say that if we lose the south part of Asia, if we lose the Malay Peninsula, if we lose Burma, if we lose India, we shall have lost every hope that we ever had of being able to maintain free institutions in any part of the eastern world. So I commend to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee a study, and I give them a slogan: Rather than fleets for Formosa, let us have some food for India.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator realizes that in the solution of the problems of India, Pakistan, Siam, Burma, Indonesia, and Indochina, the question of Formosa and the recognition of China are vital and can be the heavy last straw which will cause those countries to go Communist. I have just traveled through the countries, and I talked to the prime ministers, the foreign ministers, the finance ministers, and the various other ministers, and the people, and those are the things that can change the whole southern part of Asia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has not had the privilege of being in Asia. As a matter of fact, I may say very candidly I do not think a 2 months' trip would really inform anyone very much. It helps, but it takes a long time to become a good student of a particular area. It takes many years even for a man to know his own State, much less to know a State that he cannot even communicate with, because of differences in languages. But there are people who have spent a lifetime studying these areas. There are those who have read hundreds and hundreds of volumes, and people who have made it their life's work to know. I submit that an issue in the Asiatic world today that is much more prominent in the minds of the people of Asia than communism, is food. Hunger is consuming them, and hungry people do not think well. Hungry people do not have rational minds. They do not have healthy bodies.

There are other things we could do. Since there has been mention of what the other nations will do if we recognize

Communist China, that issue will have to be discussed in terms of the facts. I am not prepared to make any statement as to whether or not we ought to recognize Communist China. I do not like Communists. I wish we did not have to recognize any of them. But I may say that the Communists in Europe and the Communists in Asia are making millions of converts on the basis of one thing we are doing in America. The Congress of the United States can do something about it, and it will not cost a penny. It can be made bipartisan or strictly one party. I refer to the passage of civil-rights legislation. Wherever one goes in the world, my colleagues, it so happens that the one tool and the one weapon the Communists have against us is the way we treat our own people. In India, south Asia, Africa, and everywhere else in the world, the one weapon the Communists have against us is that we talk freedom, we talk human rights, we talk equal rights, but we discriminate against our own people.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sorry that Members on the Senator's side of the aisle are not present when he is arguing the civil-rights issue. The Senator from Michigan spent many hours getting a civil-rights bill, the antilynching bill, out of committee, but he has been unable to have it considered on the floor. I want to join the Senator in trying to obtain the passage of this civil-rights bill, and even the other bills which are on the calendar today. I hope the Senator will help in getting them up for consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know of the sincerity of the Senator from Michigan, and I surely want to congratulate him on his good work, but I say here is where we need a bipartisan policy. This is indeed where we need it. I listened to the broadcast of Ed Murrow over CBS on Sunday, with all his correspondents over the world, reporting on the first half of the century. Thirteen men, I believe it was, reported to the American people, with the greatest ensemble of celebrated news commentators that we have had in 50 years. What was the substance of the news commentaries? The substance was that our moral armor plate is weak. We have the fleets, but it takes something more than fleets to win this struggle for the minds of men. What is going on in Asia now is a struggle for the minds of men. Our armor plate is weak as we struggle for human freedom in Asia and generally for the freedom of the human race. It is weak in the fact that we think somehow or other we can buy peace with dollars. We need to recognize that it is not only the gift but it is the spirit of the giver that counts. We in the Congress should say to the American people we are prepared to help feed those people who today have the whiplash of the Communist standing over them. India is within 50 or 60 miles of the Soviet Union, with the Communist agents working in every village and town in an attempt to overthrow democratic government. What is the most important problem of the Government of India today? It is food.

Who has the food? We talk about ships. I say we are immoral. We are almost anti-Christian. We ought to get down on our knees and pray to God to forgive us for our sins, for here on the eastern coast of our land are Liberty ships, 10,000-ton freighters loaded with wheat which the Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased, and the wheat is rotting. The wheat is stored up, and here are people who are dying of hunger, with the Communists on top of them, with their government almost tottering. What are we doing? We are sitting around saying we cannot get along with Pakistan, or with this country or with some other country.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Did I understand the Senator to say that the wheat is rotting?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not imply that all the wheat is rotting. Undoubtedly some of the wheat is rotting.

Mr. THYE. Did I understand the Senator correctly?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I withdraw the statement.

Mr. THYE. I hope the Senator will withdraw it, because I hope the administrators of the Commodity Credit Corporation are not so negligent that they are permitting wheat to rot merely by reason of the fact that the wheat has not been turned or has not been properly aired. I hope the Senator will withdraw the statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be more than happy to withdraw the statement. However, I may say that if we needed to find some rotting wheat in storage, I think we could find it. Rotten wheat or no rotten wheat, all I want to point out to the Senate, which is so interested in our foreign policy, is that one of the important measures which can be taken, as has been developed in the last 3 or 4 months, is to let the people of India get some of the Commodity Credit Corporation wheat on a price-concession basis. They cannot pay for it. At any rate, they cannot pay the market price for it. I still say, Mr. President, rather than fleets for Formosa, how about a little food for humanity?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the problem of India is not so simple as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota would have us believe. After all is said and done, so far as food is concerned, I do not believe I saw as much food at any other place on my trip as I saw in India. One-third of all the cattle of the world are in India, but a religious belief of the people prohibits them from killing the cattle and eating the beef. I do not think we should go into India and tell the people to change the religious beliefs which they have held for thousands of years, long before Christianity was ever heard of. I do not think that would be our province. We can ship all the wheat we have to India, and the people will feed it to their cattle, and a little child or an old man will be starving to death within 5 feet of the cargo ship which transported the wheat. Furthermore, if we take the surplus food from this country and try to buy the hearts and minds of the people of India, to bribe them

from going communistic, we shall starve 80,000,000 inhabitants of Pakistan. They, too, are in the underbelly of Russia.

With reference to democracy in India, we talked to the leaders there, and did not find one who believed in democracy. I found them all to be Socialists. So far as I am concerned, I cannot see any sense in fattening socialism when we are trying to starve communism, because both socialism and communism end in exactly the same spot. There is no such thing as communism. Marx and Lenin were Socialists, not Communists. When we think one-sixteenth of the world's population can feed, industrialize, arm, and defend, not only western Europe but the Middle East, the Near East, and the Far East, and still maintain our standard of living, we are kidding ourselves; we are deluding ourselves. We would destroy and bankrupt the Nation both economically and militarily, and then the thing of which peoples all over the world are afraid will take over on our very streets.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was very difficult to find anyone who was interested in the form of government or the economic system of America. Is it not true that we found no one who was actually trying to sell the American form of government, which consists of a political system and an economic system, a political system which protects the life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness of its people, and the property of its people through a three-dimension system, executive, judicial, and legislative? We found no one who believed in such a system, nor did we find any American, outside of members of the committee, and those who were accompanying the committee, trying to sell the American system or trying to tell the people that any aid they received from us, be it food, economic aid, or military aid, was being bought by the sweat and the brawn of the American people under a system which has operated successfully in America and which would successfully operate there, if they would try it. Is not that a fact?

Mr. JENNER. That is exactly the fact. We talk about lifting those people up. In every country we entered, countries which have been in existence for thousands of years, with a basic economy of agriculture, we found the people talking about being industrialized. They said, in effect, "You have got to furnish the money, the materials, and the machinery to industrialize us." Every nation is wanting to become self-sufficient.

Mr. FERGUSON. And nationalistic.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The most outstanding isolationist in America, if that is what we call them, is an evangelist compared with the nationalism we found in other countries. Is not that a correct statement?

Mr. JENNER. That is true.

RECESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 6, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 5 (legislative day of January 4), 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Edward W. Barrett, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Oscar L. Chapman, of Colorado, to be Secretary of the Interior, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

John F. Floberg, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral, for a term of 4 years.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be United States alternate governor of the International Monetary Fund, and United States alternate governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years.

William McChesney Martin, Jr., of New York, to be United States executive director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

John S. Hooker, of Maryland, to be United States alternate executive director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

Ely E. Palmer, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Conciliation Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, December 11, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION FOR THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF PORT-AU-PRINCE, REPUBLIC OF HAITI

John Shaw Young, of New York, to be United States Commissioner to the International Exposition for the Bicentennial of the Founding of Port-au-Prince, Republic of Haiti, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Maj. Gen. James H. Burns, United States Army, retired, to be Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, Mutual Defense Assistance, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

John Hallowell Ohly, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director, Mutual Defense Assistance, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Gerald A. Drew, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, now United States representative on the United Nations Special Balkan Committee, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United

States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan.

Jefferson Patterson, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Special Balkan Committee established by the General Assembly of the United Nations October 21, 1947, vice Gerald A. Drew.

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Yugoslavia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Irving Florman, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Avra M. Warren, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Glenn A. Abbey, of Wisconsin, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Eugene H. Clay, of New York.

H. Gerald Smith, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Frederick T. Merrill, of the District of Columbia.

Edward W. Mill, of Illinois.

Angier Biddle Duke, of New York, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Hyman Bloom, of New York.

William Kane, of New York.

Fred M. Wren, of Maine.

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

Frank E. Hook, of Michigan, to be a member of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1953. (Reappointment.)

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Josh Lee, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for a term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1955, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. (Reappointment.)

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION

James E. Friend, of Texas, to be Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Edward T. McCormick, of Arizona, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1952, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Donald C. Cook, of Michigan, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1954, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

MUNITIONS BOARD

Hubert E. Howard, of Illinois, to be Chairman of the Munitions Board.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Denis J. McMahon, of New York, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of New York, to fill an existing vacancy. Mr. McMahon is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

George T. Cromwell, of Ferndale, Md., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md. (Reappointment.)

James J. Connors, of Juneau, Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska. (Reappointment.)

Harry A. Zinn, of Denver, Colo., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo. (Reappointment.)

JUDGES, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Hon. David L. Bazelon, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Charles Fahy, of New Mexico, to be a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. George Thomas Washington, of the District of Columbia, to be a judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. William Henry Hastie, of the Virgin Islands, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. H. Nathan Swaim, of Indiana, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. James R. Kirkland, of Delaware, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Charles F. McLaughlin, of Nebraska, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Burnita Shelton Matthews, of the District of Columbia, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. She is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Frank A. Hooper, of Georgia, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Georgia. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. M. Neil Andrews, of Georgia, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Georgia. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Carroll O. Switzer, of Iowa, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Iowa. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Delmas C. Hill, of Kansas, to be United States district judge for the district of Kansas. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. J. Skelly Wright, of Louisiana, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Irving R. Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. John F. X. McGohey, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Gregory F. Noonan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Sidney Sugarman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Gus J. Solomon, of Oregon, to be United States district judge for the district of Oregon. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Thomas J. Clary, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Allan K. Grim, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Owen McIntosh Burns, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Robert L. Taylor, of Tennessee, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Hon. Willis W. Ritter, of Utah, to be United States district judge for the district of Utah. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Clarence U. Landrum, of Minnesota, to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

John J. Sheehan, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

John Joseph Hickey, of Wyoming, to be United States attorney for the district of Wyoming. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Louis F. Knop, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Earl R. Burns, of Wyoming, to be United States marshal for the district of Wyoming. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 6, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 4, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of love and hope, through all the length of changing years, Thy goodness faileth never. Lead us this day in the paths of righteousness, for Thy name's sake. In these confused times save us from any panic of spirit, because